

THE
PLEA FOR INFANTS

AND ELDER PEOPLE,

concerning their Baptisme.

OR

A PROCESSE OF THE PASSAGES

between M. Iohn Smyth and Richard Clyfton:

Wherein, first is proved,

that the baptizing of Infants of beleivers, is an ordinance of God.

Secondly,

that the rebaptizing of such, as have been formerly baptised in
the Apostate Churches of Christians, is utterly unlawfull.

Also,

The reasons and objections to the contrary,
answered.

Divided into two principal heads.

I.

Of the first Position, concerning the baptizing of infants.

II.

Of the second Position, concerning the rebaptizing
of Elder people;

Mat. 7. 15. 16.

*Watch of false Prophets which come to you in sheep clothing, but inwardly they are
ravelling wolves: you shall know them by their fruits.*

2 Pet. 2. 1. 2.

*For there were false Prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false Teachers
among you, which secretly shall bring in damnable Heresies, even denying the Lord
that hath bought them, & bring upon themselves swift damnation. And many
shall follow their damnable wayes, by whom the way of truth
shall be evil spoken of.*

Printed at Amsterdam by Gyles Thorp.

Anno 1610.

Thomas Hooker *John Calvin*

To all them which are called and sanctified of God
the Father, and returned to Iesus Christ.

Let it not seem strange (deare brethren) neither cause
any to distrust the right wayes of the Lord, because from
amongst vs some have departed from the sayth, and re-
turned after errors: For the holy Ghost hath foretold
that even from amongst our selves, there should men
speaking perverse things to draw Disciples after the, Act.
20. 30. And with such, the primitive Apostolike Churches were greatly
molested, and that whilest the Apostles were living. Iohn doth also
witness that in his tyme there were many Antichrists, they went (sayth
he) out from vs. 1. Ioh. 2. 18. 19. meaning even out of the bosome
of the Church. And our Saviour sayth, many false Prophets shall arise
and deceive many. Mat. 24. 11. And Peter sayth, many shall
follow their damnable wayes, 2. Pet. 2. 2. All which may teach
us not to be offended when the like doth befall to the Churches in our times.
Seeing it is incident to Gods people, not onely to be persecuted by enemies
without, but also grieved with false brethren, that under pretence of
more sinceritie of religion, will seek to destroy the faith, being the very
instruments of Satan, whom he subborneth to deceive the unstable and to
corrupt their minds from the simplicitie that is in Christ. 2. Cor. 11. 3.
These things being considered, it becometh us to mind the exhortations
and warnings given by the Apostles of Christ, that is, to stand fast
and keep the instructions which we have been taught. 2. Thes. 2.
15. And not to beleewe every spirit, but to trie the spirits whether
they be of God or no: for many false Prophets are gone into the
world, 1 Ioh. 4. 1. And the rather it stands vs the more upon to take
heed to our selves and be admonished by the word of the Lord, because,
as the Devil on the one hand, prevayleth in these our times, by worldly
arguments, of profit, pleasure and the like, to keep many back from
walking in the right wayes of God: So on the other hand, (under glori-

The Preface.

houses of pretended holynes) hath he deceived many, and drawn
into damnable heresies, labouring to poyson the fountaines of whol-
some doctrine, reveiled in these last dayes unto his Church: And wher-
in God in mercie hath preached unto vs the Gospel (that formerly he had
promised to Abraham our father, and by the Apostles unto both Jewes
and Gentiles) that a long time hath bene greatly obscured through the
mists of popish doctrines, now seeketh to spoile the church of Christ
altogether, by that detestable heresie of Anabaptisme, which as
hath overspread many places, to the great annoyance of the people of
God: So (as a leprosie) hath it at this present infected some of our owne
countrymen, who are not onely raynted therewith, but have revolted fro
the faith, and taken upon them the profession thereof, and published their
hereticall opinions in our owne language. For there is lately set forth
a certaine Treatise of theirs, intituled, The Character of the Beast,
A title as it is most blasphemous (being understood of the baptising
of infants) so is the book it self full of many dangerous errors, wherewith
simple may easily be deceived. And seeing the same book is sent over
our own country, and is spread abroad into the hands of many, I have
thought good also, to give warning to all that loves the Lord Jesus and
carefull of their own salvation, to take heed therof. And for this
end have published this Treatise following, containing a Processe of the
Passages between Mr. Smyth (the author of that book) and me, wherein
whose eyes it shal please God to open) may see the notable sleights of Sa-
tan by this his instrument, who first, sought to disgrace the holy Scrip-
tures translated, and to cast them out of Gods worship, and now in his
Character, to destroy the covenant of grace (which of old was given to
Abraham including the children with the parents,) and to bring in a
new Gospel that excludes the children of the faithfull both fro the cove-
nant and baptism the seale therof. I had no purpose of publishing these
my writings, had not the occasion bene offered by Mr. Smyth in win-
ning out my former private Passages: but so having done, I could not
possibly, then to publish these my labours also, vnles I should have bene inuri-
ous to the truth.

The Preface to the Reader.

Being I had received the copie of Mr Smythes book in written hand, which he purposedly sent unto me, as a reply to my former answer to his two Anabaptistical Positions, whereunto I had almost finished this my second answer before his book was printed. Otherwise (if I had not bene so interested therein) I should have bene glad if this work had been in hand by others more sufficient then my self. But thus God hath disposed to imploy me in this part of his service at this present: I desire the godly Reader, to accept this my small endeavours, proceeding from an hart earnestly striving to mainteyne that faith, which was given unto the Saints and to supply my weaknes with his better labours as there shalbe cause. And withall to take notice, that I have bene downe the whol Passages (touching this controversie) between Mr Smyth and me. First, his Positions with the Reasons annexed. 2. My answer thereunto written in private unto him, which (without my knowledge) he published together with his reply, committing that against me therein, which he condemneth in Mr Barnard against himself. Paragraphs in the epistle to the Reader. Thirdly, the Summe of his Reply. And lastly, my Answer thereunto. So that the Reader may see how these things have (from the beginning) passed between us. The Lord give us to discern the truth from falsehood, to look to ourselves that we loose not the things which we have done, but that we may receive a full reward. And now unto him that is able to keep us that we fall not, & to present us faultlesse before the presence of his glory with ioye: To God onely our Saviour be glorie and Maiesitie, Dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen.

Richard Clifton.

AN ANSWER TO Mr. SMYTHES

Epistle to the Reader, which he hath directed,

To every one that loveth the truth in sincerity.

BY these wordes, it seemeth Mr Smyth would intimate, that his care is to mainteyne the truth, and that in sinceritie he loveth the same, whereas in deed, he hath destroyed the faith, is become an enemy to the covenant of grace, & a perverter of the right wayes of the Lord: and withall so confident in defence of his heresies, that he dares to challenge a combate with all the Separation: belike to scare men with great words, and to boast with Rabshake, as if his forces were invincible: But what they are it will appeare in this discourse following. In the Epistle it self, first Mr Smyth seemeth to excuse their mutabilitie in Religion, saying: *It may be thought most strange that a man should oft times change Religion, and is cannot be accounted a commendable qualitie in any man so much as alterations, &c. this must needs be true (and we confesse) if one condition be maintained, that the Religion which a man channepeth be the truth, for otherwise to change Religion, is commendable, &c.*

But Mr Smyth and his company have changed a true Religion for a false, and therefore that can be no commendable qualitie in them: And such inconstant persons (as himself saith) cannot escape the deserved imputation of folly or Weaknes of iudgement thereon. Thus out of his owne mouth producing sentence against himself: For that alteration of him & his company, not fro falshood to truth, but the leaving of the truth (which formerly they professed) & a taking up of error after error: first calling into question, whether the Scriptures being translated into other tongues, were not the writings of men. Differenc. pag. 10. Then casting the reading of them out of the worship of God, affirming that there is no better Warant to bring translations of Scripture into the Church, and to read them as parts and helps of worship, then to bring in expositions, paraphrases and sermons upon the Scripture, seeing all these are equally humane in respect of the works, equally drome in respect of the matter they handle. Differ. pag. 10. And for the same cause, leparated themselves from other Churches that did read and vse the same in their publike meetings. After this, they dissolved their Church (which before was conioyned in the fellowship

fellowship of the Gospel & profession of the true faith) & Mr Smyth being Pastor thereof, gave over his office, as did also the Deacons, and devised to enter a new communion by renouncing their former baptism, and taking upon them an other, of mans invention, bringing in an other Gospel, besides that which was preached to Abraham, Gen. 12. 3, & 17. 7. &c. Gal. 3. 8. And now againe, many of this new communion have separated themselves from the rest, holding the error about the incarnation of Christ. An other sort are excommunicate, namely M. Smyth & others with him, for holding (as it is reported by some that were of them) that their new washed companie is no true church, and that there cannot be in a church the administratiō of baptism & other ordinances of Christ, without Officers, contrarie to his former judgment. practise & writings, & yet reſteth not but is inquiring after a new way of walking, (as the same persons affirme) breeding more errors, as is strongly suspected, and by his manuscripts partly appears. Whereby it is manifest, that these men cannot cleare themselves of instabilitie & changeableness in Religion, but are guilty of that inconstancie that is worthy reproof and damnable.

Further he sayth, *For a man of a Turke to become a Jew, of a Jew a Papist, of a Papist a Protestant, are all commendable changes &c. so that, not to change religion is evil simple: & therefore that, we should fall from Puritanisme to Brownisme, and from Brownisme to true christian baptism, is not simply evil in it self, except it be proved that, we have fallen from the true religion, &c.*

Here Mr. Smyth would make the world beleieve (as it is the manner of all heretikes) that their alterations were goings forward to further truths, and therefore commendable. But if their true Christian baptism, (whereof they boast) prove a notable heresie, (as it is indeed, & in this Treatise is proved) then his comparison holds not, but rather their estate is like to those in 1 Tim. 1. 19. *that put away sayth & a good conscience, and as concerning sayth, have made shipwrack. And that bring in damnable heresies.* 2 Pet. 2. 1. *denying the covenant of grace, and the lawful use of the scriptures, &c. to bring upon themselves swift damnation, if God give them not speedy repentance.*

Next M. Smyth setteth down the questions controverted, and hereafter answered, affirming that this controversie is between them and the Separation, whereas he might as well have sayd, betweene them and all christian churches, that have been or are at this day: for it is not we alone that
condemne

Epistle to the Reader.

...these their heresies, but both the ancient and moderne Church, and writers in all ages, (as with one consent) have opposed against

But where he pretends the publishing of this controversy, to be for the glory of God the manifesting of the truth to our owne nation, and the destruction of the error of some, he geueth vs to mynd how Satan hath bewitched his soule to believe that such can be the effects of his heretical opinions. It is the policy of the Diuill to propound glorious ends, to such as he seduceth, as Iacob and others, & teacheth his Ministers to do the like, that by fayre & flattering speeches, and shewes of good, they might more easily deceaue the people. And therefore seing we are forwarned that there shall be false Teachers amongst vs, which priuily shall bring in damnable heresies, it belongeth vs to mynd the counsel of the Apostles, to try the spirits, 1. Ioh. 4. 1. And not to be caried about with every wynd of doctrine. Ephe. 4. 14.

Now happily, (sayth Mr. Smyth,) some man wil wish that the controversy had been with the Rabbies of the Separation, and not with Mr. Cyprian, whom they call him to be a weak man, unable to deale in so great a controversy: yet, let the reader take notice that though it be Mr. Cyprians pen, yet it is not onely Mr. Cyprians words & defence, but his allegations & Reasons are the best plea of the greatest Rabbies that are. And if they can say better, they may now speake, for by publishing answers to his Reasons, we do chalenge at the separation in speciall to the combat.

This Challenger would fayne haue the world to take notice, that he deales with an aduersary that is too weak to try out this controversy with him, & to forestall mens judgments before ever they come to the reading of my answers. And because he would not be seene to be the Author himselfe of any disgrace, he imputeth this report to the Rabbies of the Separation, as it pleaseth him in his taunting maner to terme them / who (I am persuaded) are guiltles thereof. But if any had so sayd vnto him in private, he doth he in publishing the same, breake the bounds of love. For myne owne parte, whether any haue so spoken or not, it shal not offend me, I know the Lord, measureth his guiltes to every one as he wil. 1 Cor. 12. 11. I praise God for that I haue, and do not envy, but reioyce in the gifts that God bestoweth vpon others, and pray that they may vie therein to his glory, and to edification. Notwithstanding though Mr Smyth thinke me to weak to incounter with him, yet the Lord assisting me, I meane not for all these his disgraceful speeches, to yield him the cause; or
give

An answer to Mr Smythes

give back one foot from the defence thereof, knowing that the truth which I contend for: will discover and convince his damnable errors: which though he set a glorious shew vpon (as a marchant of false wares) by misapplying of Scriptures: yet wil the falsehood of them appeare to al such whose eyes God shal open, to discerne between the truth and lies. Moreover if I in my weaknes, make to appeare how vnconscionably & untruly Mr Smyth dealeth against the truth: his glorious boasting and Philistine valour, will have the more disgrace, then if he had dealt with men of greater gifts: and God shall have the greater glorie, to foyle such a weak Champion with weak and base meanes.

As for my allegations and reasons which he saith, *are the best plea of the greatest Rabbies*, &c. herein he both taxeth me and wrongeth them, me, and I had bene but their pen man in my former answer; them, in saying my reasons are their best plea, whereas he hath had neither conference with them, by speeches or writing about these matters, save onely with Mr Robinson. And therefore so to speak without triall, bewrayes but the barenes of his spirit against them. Thus Mr Smyth preparing way for his great challenge, by pretending mine insufficiencie, calles forth the Rabbies (as he termes them) to speak, challengging the whole Separation to the debate: whereas a wise man would haue spared such speeches vntill he had seen the issue of his combate, already attempted: and not thus to provoke others, vntill he had greater likelihood of victorie. As for those reviled men whom now he calles vpo for better, *if they can say better*, they have already sayd and written so much against his errors, as I am assured he will never be able to answer, and when it pleaseth him to reply (if there be occasion) I doubt not but as they have done, so the Lord will inable them to batter downe with spiritual weapons, his greatest forces, that he shall be able to raise against the truth.

And whereas Mr Smyth seemeth to insinuate, that by his answering of my reasons, he hath answered theirs, herein he is deceived: for the reasons in my former answer, (be they what they are,) I acknowledge for mine own, (though written unto him without any purpose of publishing,) therefore weaknes be found in them, let it be imputed vnto me, and not vnto our Teachers, (who had no hand in setting downe thereof) nor yet vnto the truth itself. As for his challengging of the whole Separation, and vnto his intemperate speeches in his epistle, they bewray in him a malicious

our poppe Church,) and putt vp with too loftie a conceit of his strength. Did ever any of the Prophets or servants of God thus challenge a combate with the Lords people? in deed such braving speeches were uttered from Goliath, 1 Sam. 17. 10. that defied the whol host of Israel and from Rabshake. 2. King. 18. 23-- 25. against the Iewes: But we never heard that an Israelite professing the religion of God, vsed such proud chalenges, as this man doth.

I pray you Mr. Smyth, wherein hath the separation offended you, or wronged you, that you desyre rather to quarrel with them, then with other Churches holding the same truth in this thing, agaynst you? To the Elders and brethren were you most welcome, and glad they were of you so long as you walked in the fayth with them. Why is it that you become their adversary? is it because they have rejected you, and your company for your errors, which you wilfully maintayne? Alas, they must needs be so, unless they would become vnfaithful to God.

Next after this Challenge, Mr. Smyth chargeth the separation with a constitution, ministry, worship and government, saying.

We knowen to all the Separation, that we account them in respect of their communion, to be as very an blasfemy, as either her mother England, or her grandmother Rome. And although we held her a true church in our ignorance, yet now being better informed &c. we protest against her as well for her false constitution, as for her false ministry, worship and government &c. the false constitution is of infants baptised.

Concerning the constitution of a Church we do not hold that any visible Church can stand onely of infants, neyther that their baptisme doth geve them being thereof. 1. Seeing there can be no baptising of infants, where there are not first Elder people, with whome they come vnder the covenant of God. 2. Baptism is an other thing diuers from the Church, Ephe. 4. 4. 5. it maketh none to be the people of God, onely it sealeth vp to be his people them that are so formerly by vertue of his covenant. 3. Els Turkes or Indians professing the Popish Religion being baptized, should be a true Church (for Mr. Smyth holdeth the baptisme of such to be true baptism, if so they confesse their fayth & sinns) 4. Then circumcision should haue made the Siehemites a true Church (for that which baptism can doe now in constituting of a Church, circumcision could do then) wherefore I say, baptism is an ordinance of Christ geuen to his Church to seale vp his covenant to his people: but is not that whol essentiall constitutio thereof. And

**

there-

† Charac.
pag. 51.

therefore our baptizing of infants (if it were admitted to be unlawful) can not make the constitution of our Church to be false, much les being the commaundement of the Lord, can it so doo. And thus Mr. Smyth holdeth in the first poynt of his charge. As for the other things he chargeth vs withall, shall receive answer in their due place.

But here further he proceedeth to affirme. *That no man can separate from England, as from a false Church, except he also do separate from the baptism of such &c.*

Wherevnto he may be answered, that it wil not follow, that they which separate from a Church standing in apostasie, or sinne, must separate from the baptism therein receaved, or yet from any other of Gods ordinances there retayned. We are commaunded to forsake the whoredomes of Babylon, Apoc. 18. 4. but not to sepearate from any ordinance of Christ that is found therein, save onely from the polutions thereof. Yet Mr. Smyth cannot deny, that a Church standing in Apostasy, is to be separated from, when the baptism therein receaved (if it be of such as confesse their fayth and sins) is still to be retayned, for such baptism, (sayth he) is true Baptism, though administred by Antichristians, Character p. 51. 2. Those Israelits that separated from Jeroboams Church (which stood in Apostasy) & went to Ierusalem 2. Cor. 30. 11. did not separate fro their circumcision therein receaved: No more are we from our baptism, as afterward is proved. As for his Reason.

That the baptism of England cannot be true and to be reteyned, and the Church of England false and to be rejected &c. It is but as if he should say, the circumcision of Israell cannot be true and to be reteyned, and the Church of Israell false and to be rejected, I speake of Israell being in Apostacy. And therefore thus I answer vnto it, that baptism retayned in Rome and in all Apostate Churches, is baptism, and is not to be repeated, as in the latter part of this Treatise, is proved. And seing Mr. Smyth holdeth there may be true baptism in an Apostate Church if they confesse their fayth, doth not he crosse himself here to say, *neither can the Church of England possibly be false, except the baptism be false?* Now if true baptism may be in an apostate Church as he affirmeth, then a Church may be false (that is apostate) & not baptism, by his owne reasoning. Yet this man chargeth vs with contradiction, v^z. to say, *England hath a false constitution, Engl. hath a true baptism.* We hold baptism so to be true in an apostate church, as circumcision was in the

Apostate

Epistle to the Reader.

The Church of Israel, & otherwise we do not affirm. Now concerning
baptizing of infants, Mr. Sm. thus proceedeth, saying, *It seemeth to us the
unreasonable heresy, of all Antichristianisme, for considering what baptisme is: And
no more capable of baptisme then is any unreasonable, or insensible creature.*
Then addeth 3. Reasons agaynst it. 1. from his owne description
of baptisme, saying: *baptisme is not the washing with water, but it is the baptisme of
the confession of the mouth, and washing with water, &c.* These
blasphemous speeches, against the ordinance of Christ bewrayeth
that spirit this man is: Gods ordinance is a *most unreasonable heresy* with
yea the *most unreasonable of all Antichristianisme*. Thus iustifying all the
heresies of the Papists and their detestable heresies in comparison of ba-
ptizing of infants. Besides his odious and blasphemous comparison, af-
firming *Infants no more capable of baptisme, then the unreasonable and insensible
creatures.* So that in his judgement, a horse, yea a block may aswell be
baptized, as the children of the Church, whom the Lord of his free grace
brought together with their parents, to be his by an everlasting covenant,
Gen. 17. 7. and therefore are holy, and capable of the blessing of Christ.
Cor. 7. 14. Jer. 1. 5. Luk. 1. 15. Mark. 10. 16. as hereafter is sufficiently
proved. And therefore to compare these infants with vnreasonable and in-
sensible creatures, as touching the participation of Baptisme, argueth the
unworth of such comparisons, to be void of spiritual sense and reason, and
to follow the corruption of his own heart in hatred against the truth,
and to mind what he affirmeth.

Concerning his description of Baptisme and those Scriptures which he
bringeth for proof thereof, see them answered hereafter, pag. 94. where I
have shewed, 1. that the baptisme of the Spirit, is no part of that outward
ceremonie of baptisme that is administered by man, but is the inward work
of the spirit in the elect of God. 2. That the confession of faith & of sinns,
is no part of the Sacrament of Baptisme: seeing the confession of sinns, is so
often to be repeated, as we transgresse against the Lord, & likewise of faith,
as we have occasion administered vnto us. And therefore baptisme, which is
given to be the seale of Gods covenant to his Church, is the baptizing of
the faithful and their seed with water, into the name of the father, and of
the sonne and of the holy Ghost, Mat. 3. 11. with Mat. 28. 19. & of this, in-
fants are capable.

##

Neyther

An answer to Mr. Smyth

neither is their baptism *folly*, (as Mr. Smyth sayth) but it will prove his folly to make mans confession a part of the Sacrament, which oftentimes is hypocritical, (as it was in S. Magus) & to shut out of Gods covenant whom the Lord hath accepted. And it will prove his folly to denye baptism to infants, because they cannot performe such actions, as in other respects are required of the elder sort that are to be baptised, who also nor having transgressed in like manner, therefore need not so to confesse. And it will prove his folly, to deny that an infant can be baptised with the spirit: for to say, is to deny, that an infant can be saved. But of these things hereafter.

His 2. Reason is taken from Johns baptism, framed thus.

Johns baptism was the baptism of repentance. Infants have not Repentance, therefore can not have the baptism of Repentance.

To this Argument I answer thus, 1. That repentance is required of such as have actually transgressed, not as the proper cause of baptism, but as a necessary fruit of faith, & condition of the Gospel required of them, that being of yeares are to be received into the church: whether before or after Christs coming. But of the infants of the saythful, whether of those that are newly received into the church, or of believers borne in the church, it is not so. Ergo &c.

2. Repentance was not required of the infants of the Jewes before they were circumcised: no more is it to be required of our infants before baptism, these two Sacraments being the same in use.

3. If *Baptism of repentance* be understood onely of the tyme past, & not of the tyme to come, then is that a false exposition of Johns baptism. For as he taught that those that came to be baptised should repent: so also his baptism did preach a continual dying to sinne, or practice of repentance all our life long, Rom. 6. 4. And therefore though children cannot repent of actual sinne, which they are not to do, they having not committed the same: yet is their baptism the baptism of repentance: seeing it preacheth continual mortification & repentance to the receivers thereof, which is one true use of baptism.

His third reason is from the testimony of Tertullian & Eusebius. The words of Tertullian; (as Mr. Sm. himself hath englished them) are these.

Therefore to deferre & not to hasten baptism, is more profitable for the condition of position & age of every person, than especially as concerning young children, for whom

Epistle to the Reader.

There is no danger to bring *sureties* into danger for the baptizing of Infants, if there be no haste in the baptizing of infants. Seeing the *sureties* are disabled often to performe their promise, both by reason of mortallitie, and of the evil disposition of children, when they come to yeares for whom they promised in baptisme &c. First concerning Tertullian it is to be noted, that thus he writeth, he was fallen into the opinions of the Cataphrighes or Montanists, who held divers errors, as Augustine and others have observed out of his workes. And therefore being thus departed from the sayth; Let the Reader judge if this man be a competent witness in this case. Yet not this man affirme that infants were not baptised in his tyme, but the contrary, in that he makes mention of *sureties* for infants: saying, what necessitie is there to bring *sureties* into danger for the baptizing of infants, such words do plainly argue, that the Church then used to baptize in-
fants.

Agayne, that which he affirmeth was his owne private judgment, and his Reasons are of no weight, as the bringing of *sureties* into danger, and the *sureties* are disabled often tymes to performe their promise &c. such *sureties* being appointed of God. 3. P. Mart. Cl. 4. ca. 8. affirmeth that Tertullian denied Baptism to yong men and yong widowes; and his owne words here related, do seeme to intimate some such like thing, in saying, *to deferre and not to hasten baptisme, is more profitable for the condition, disposition and of every person.* And this he meaneth of others, then yong children. For he speaketh of yong children, saying, *especially concerning yong children.* 4. Crispen, *State of the Church* pag. 47. 48. witnesseth that Tertullian brought extreme unction after baptism, the *Synne of the Crosse*, offering for the dead, and the like doctrine of the Montanists. Now if Tertullians judgment be thus, and agaynst infants baptism, why not also for extreme unction the *Synne of the Crosse*, and the like his errors, seeing all these are fruits proceeding from the same tree?

But thus this adversary careth not who the witness is, so he will speake in favour of his heresy, let him be Montanist, Papist, or what other soever. But let it be further observed, that about Tertullians tyme and after, some deferred their baptism, until they thought they should dye, and so were not baptised until they fell into some great sickness, as Theodosius &c. And this seemeth to be Tertullians error; as if baptism was for washing away of sinnes past, and not to come.

An answer to M. Smyths

Concerning that which Eusebius reporteth of Athanasius his baptizing of children in sport, I have answered, pag. 109. and set downe reasons to prove that those children were not children of the church, but of some of the heathen, which were instructed in the fayth of Christ by the church, but were not received into the communion of the same. These are the two Auncients that M. Smyth produceth against us, whereof neither of them affirmeth that the church did not baptise infants in those tymes. Now these two, I will oppose other two Auncients amongst many others, that do testifie that infants in their tymes and before, were baptised, viz. Origen, who sayth, that, *the church received from the Apostles, to give baptisme to infants*. lib. 1. ad Rom. And Augustine de Bap. contra Donatist. lib. 4. cap. 3. who speaking of the Baptisme of Infants, sayth, *that which the whole church holdeth, neyther is ordainyd by counsels; but alwayes hath been holden; we are to leave to be delivered by Apostolical authoritie.*

The next corruption that the Separation is charged withal, is, *to have a false ministerie.* Now the Ministers that we have are of Pastors & Teachers, called thereunto by election of the Church, according to these Scriptures Eph. 4, 9, 11, 12. Rom. 12, 7, 8. 1 Cor. 12, 28. Acts. 13, 1, 2. Revel. 1, 10. Nehem. 8, 1, -8. Mat. 23, 2. Mal. 2, 7. A. 14, 23. And practise of the primitive churches. And of this Ministerie of Pastors and Teachers M. Smyth himself approveth in his Principles, pag. 18. and in his Questions, and answers, pag. 8. printed this last year, 1609. he describing the officers of the Church, devides them, first into Bishops and Deacons, then the Bishops into Pastors, or Teachers, or Elders, and withal describeth the Pastor, to be a bishop over one particular Church, excelling in the word of wisdom. The Teacher, to be a Bishop over one particular church; excelling in the word of knowledge. The Governour, to be a Bishop of one particular visible Church, excelling in wise government. Thus hath he written: and yet we having no other Ministerie, then he himself approveth, chargeth us to have a false Ministerie, not caring to crosse himself, so he may utter his bitterness against the Church of Christ.

The 3. corruption this adversearie chargeth us withal, is, *false manner of reading books.* This he sayth, but proves it not. I will briefly set downe one practise, that the Reader may take notice, how unjustly we are charged. 1. For prayer & giving of thanks, that is publickly performed by our Pastor or Teacher, who invoke the name of God & praise him for his bene-

Epistle to the Reader.

The Spirit directs their hearts to conceive and giveth utterance, & without the use of any book during that action, according to these Scriptures, Rom. 8. 26. 27. Eph. 6. 18, 19. Col. 4. 2. Act. 6. 4. Num. 8. 23. Nehem. 9. 3, 38. Ezra. 9. 5, 15. & 10. 1. Joel. 2. 17.

They read the holy Scriptures, translated into our owne language, one or two or three chapters or more, as time wil serve, shewing briefly the meaning thereof. Which is warranted by these Scriptures. Neh. 8. 3, 8. 2 Tim. 3. 11. Act. 15. 21. Col. 4. 16. 1 Thel. 5. 27. 1 Tim. 4. 13.

The Pastor or Teacher taketh some Scripture, which they ordinarily use, and after the reading thereof, do expound and apply the same, by doctrine, exhortation, &c. to the further edification of the church: according to these Scriptures. Luk. 4. 16. 21. Act. 8. 35. & 13. 15. and 20. 7. 2 Tim. 4. 13. 2 Tim. 4. 2. And together with the preaching of the word, the Sacraments are administred after the rules of Christ, with prayer and thanksgiving, according to these Scriptures: Mat. 28. 19. 1 Cor. 11. 23. Act. 20. 7. &c.

Some of the Psalmes of David, before and after the exercise of the word (the same being first read and opened by the Pastor or Teacher,) is sung of the whole church together to the praise of God, and our own edification, according to these Scriptures: Eph. 5. 19. Col. 3. 16. Mat. 26. 30. 16. 25. Psal. 95. & 92. 1. & 66. 2. & 89. 1.

Lastly, each one as he is able, contributeth to the Treasurie, whereby the Officers & poor of the church, are maynteyned: according to these Scriptures. 1 Tim. 5. 17. 18. 1 Cor. 9. 7-14. Gal. 6. 6. 1 Tim. 5. 16. Luk. 28. 1. 14. Mat. 26. 9. 10. 11. Act. 2. 42. 45. 46. & 4. 34. 35. - 37. 1 Cor. 16. 1. 2. 1 Cor. 8. 4. And this is that worship and service we publikely practise, which Mr. S. calleth false worship: how truly, let the Reader now judge.

Fourthly, concerning the Governēt of our church, (which also this advertisement taxeth) first, the Governours that we have, are such as Christ hath appointed in his Church, viz. Pastors, Teachers, & Elders, (and such as M. S. affirmeth the Eldership to consist of) the two former both teaching and ruling, the Elders employed in the governēt onely, elected of the church for the overseing, governing & guiding of the same, by the rules of Christ, whose offices and authoritie of Ruling, are warranted by these Scriptures. 1 Tim. 4. 17. Rom. 12. 6. 7. 8. 1 Cor. 12. 28. 1 Tim. 3. 5. with Rev. 2. 2. 11. 15. Act. 20. 28. Heb. 13. 8. 24.

Again

† Principles.
pag. 18.
Questions
& Answers
pag. 3.

An Answer to Mr. Smythes

Agayn, as touching the Censures, we proceed therein after Christes private faults vying private admonitions, and for publike, open reuelacion according to these Scriptures. Mat. 18. 15. -- 17. 1. Tim. 5. 20. & Can. 6. And when the offenders continue obstinate in their sinns after due admonition and conviction by the word of God; the Church being gathered together, the Pastor, or Teacher or one of the Elders in the name & by the power of our Lord Iesus Christ pronounceth the sentence of excommunication agaynst them, all the brethren consenting, according to these Scriptures. Mat. 18. 17. -- 19. 1. Cor. 5. 3. 4. &c. 1. Tim. 1. 20. And if the excommunicate do repent, he is with the Churches consent receaved againe into the communion therof, by some of the Governors according to these Scriptures. 2. Cor. 2. 17. -- 11. Mat. 18. 18. -- 20.

What Mr. Smyth can fault in this or in any other of our practices, he may at his leasure discover the same, if he be not already satisfied.

Now besides these false imputations, it pleaseth Mr. Smyth to venge agaynst this Church many yncharitable and reprochfull speeches: witness also, *As the Tyrant wished concerning the people of Rome, thus all their heads were joyned into one &c.*

To passe by his tart and bitter speeches unbecoming a professor of the Gospell, concerning his wish, I do certifie him thus much, that if it were granted, that the Separation had but one head, his wooden sword of mans doctrine, will never be able to smyte it of. Wel may he carry the Tyrants mynd, but for his wish, I trust he shall fynd a like effect therof: as the Tyrant did of his, who contrary to his expectation, found the people of Rome not to have one head, but many hands to smyte of his head: so this wisher shall fynd that the Separation hath many hands to convince his abominable errors.

And whereas he desyreth the Separation that, they will not in craftines withdraw from the combate, as hether to they have done in the matter of the Tyranny, on, Worship, and Presbyterie, &c.

He himselfe now knoweth that he hath answere to all these things, and if any delay hath bene herein, it was not any withdrawing through craftines, as he falsely chargeth vs, but we saw him so mutable and inconstant, and his latter writings to overthrow his former, that his owne workes would be a sufficient confutation thereof: And now that there was so great occasion of answere, and that he so insulted vpon the differing therof, he hath his answere given him.

preface to the Reader

his speeches, of charging and challengng vs to the defence of
I hope he wil stay his penne henceforth from such vanitie, being
not ashamed, or yet neglect to vndertake the defence of that truth
manifeste, and to manifest that he is a defender of errors and not we, as
vnderously reporteth of vs.

Furthermore, Mr Smyth requires of the Separation, and of all men, not
vnto them. *The denying of the old Testament, the Lords day, the
Magistracy, and humanity of Christ.* Why this request should be made, I know
the rules they would beare the world in hand, that they are not taynted
with these errors, which other anabaptists doo hold. Concerning the
old of them, Mr. Sm. affirmeth that the Lord made with his people vnder
the old Testament, a carnal covenant, denying that everlasting covenant in
shall to be given vnto them, or circumcision to be the scale thereof: He
denyeth the seede of the faythfull to be within the covenant of grace,
either before or since Christs comming, contrary to Gen. 17. 7. Aet. 1.
And therefore I cannot see, but that the denying both of the old and
new Testament, in this respect, may justly be imputed vnto him, as in this
manifeste following it will appeare.

For their denying of the Lords day, as yet we have lide to say, notwithstanding it is reported that some of their company, makes question ther-

But concerning the Magistracy, Mr. Smyth bewrayeth his vnfoundnes
in these words, *But of Magistrates converted to the faith and admitted into the
Church by baptism, there may questions be made, which to answer we cannot if we
could, when such things fall out, the Lord we doubt not will direct vs into the truth
concerning that matter.*

Here let the Reader observe how they plead ignorance in the matter of
the Christian Magistrate, if so they thought of his Authoritie, that he being
of the Church, was to beare the sword, and them of the Church to obey
him, as having civill power over them, and whome he might command
in defence of Religion, & of his country to take vp armes; then he eded not
be thus to speake. For by his words they geve vs to conjecture, that
they think more may be yeilded to an heathen Ruler, then to a Christian
Magistrate. If they be cleare in this pointe, they may so explaine their
saydes. Also in this pleading ignorance of the Magistracy, they seeme to
use the new Testament, not to be so playne, as Mr Smyth affirmeth, where
he

An answer to Mr. Smyth
he sayth, *All the ordinances of the new Testament are plainly taught by Christ and his disciples.* Character, pag. 34. Now if all things be taught in the new Testament, why then can he not answer those many questions that may be made about the Christian Magistrate, or why looks he for new direction well: this I perceive, that either he must deny the authority of the Christian Magistrate, or be driven to confesse that the writings of the Apostles are not playne enough to describe his office and Authority, without the Scriptures of the old Testament, from which if it be lawfull to reason concerning this matter of the Magistracy, then I hope it cannot be denied, but so it is lawfull to do, for other ordinances also.

Touching the error of the Incarnation of Christ, which also Mr. Smyth desyreth may not be imputed vnto them. It is well knowne that many of their company holding that error about the Incarnation, are separated from the rest. And Mr. Smyth him selfe (as some amongst them have reported) maketh a question about the first matter of Christs humane nature as if it werenot a poynt of fayth to beleve that it was of the virgin, though it be to be beleved that the second matter was conceived in the womb. Whether his hearers do wrong him in such reports, or how he resteth satisfied, it is best knowne to himselfe. And be it that he be full cleere of this error, yet is he tainted with the errors of general redemption and free wil, els why hath he given forth these Positions? *Christs Redemption stretcheth to all men. Man hath not lost the faculty of will, any good thing that is shewed him.* And with all added thereto his Reasons in defence thereof.

Now let the Reader judge what cause he had to desire, that these things should not be imputed vnto them.

Lastly, Mr. Smyth taketh upon him to advertise our Church saying: *Let the Separation be advertised, that whereas they do so confidently through their self-love, & self conceit, fill their mouths with heresie and herencke, as thereby they would feare Babes, that therein they tread in the steps of all the Antichristians their predecessors &c.*

For this his advertisement, if any have spoken otherwise then is meant, I am no Patrone of any such speeches, but if it was lawfull for Iohn to call the Phariseis *Generatio of vipers*, And Paul to say to Elinas, *Obstinate of sayings & all mischeiffe &c.* then is it not simply unlawfull, to use such speeches, so it be for reproofe, and not for reproche. Therefore to call them hereticks and their

Epistle to the Reader.

opinions heresies, (it being true and spoken in detestation of their errors, not of their persons;) I see no evil in so saying, see these places. Io. 8. 1. Pet. 2. 1. 2. 1. Io. 2. 18. Act. 13. 10. Gal. 3. 1. Rev. 2. 6. 15. And this be a fault in vs, why doth Mr. Smyth fil his mouth with Antichristian errors, so calling those truthe which we hold? Hath he a dispensation so to speake agaynst the truth, and yet to blame vs for calling their false doctrines, heresy? I should rather have thought, that he ought to have advertised himselfe for these reprochful & sclanderous speeches that he hath uttered agaynst our Church, & the Teachers thereof, calling them † *Rabbies of the Separation. The greatest Rabbies.* And thus speaking to the Church. As it is known to the Separation, that we account them in respect of their constitution as any as harlot as cyther her mother England or her Grandmother Rome. We protest agaynst her, as well for her false constitution, as for her false Ministry, worship, and Government. I could wish as the Tyrant wished, Concerning the people of Rome, that all their heads were joynd into one. We desire the Separation they wil not in craftiness withdrawe from the Combate. We require them, nay we charge them, you we challenge them to the defence of their errors. We protest agaynst them to be a false Church. They treade in the steps of all the Antichristians their Predecessors. Let them take heed, that notwithstanding their Syrenes songs, they prove not Cages full of most ugly and deformed Antichristian Hereticks. All these reprochfull speeches, if not more, hath he published in lesse then a sheete of paper, besides what are containyd in his Book. And yet notwithstanding all these speeches have thus passed from him, he takes vpon him to advertise vs, for that we can iustifie agaynst his doctrines & agaynst themselves, for their obstinate defending of their errors. But where he chargeth vs to call them Hereticks, & their doctrines heresie, through self love and self conceitednes &c. If he had applyed self love and conceipt to him self, I take it he might more iustly have donie it, if we may judge by his words. As for selfe love and selfe conceipt, we condemne in whomsoever. And howsoever we have our infirmities, I trust he shal not be able to tax any of vs iustly, of these imputations.

And as Mr. Smyth wisheth us not to be wyle in our owne eyes, through pryde, &c. we hope the Lord wil so teach vs. And we pray the Lord to geve him a sight of his damnable heresies whereinto he is fallen, openly sinning in the publishing thereof, to the great dishonor of God, and greiffe of al the godly: and that the almighty may preserve all that are his chosen, from being poysoned with the same.

* * 2

Richard Clyffton.

† Church
Epistle
the Rabbies

THE PROCESSE OF THE PASSAGES
between *Mr John Smyth* and *Richard Clifton*.

Mr Smyth.

CERTAINE REASONS PROPOUNDED

To *Mr Rich. Clifton*: concerning the two Propositions following.

1. That infants are not to be baptized

1. Because there is neither precept nor example in the new Testament of any infants that were baptized, by Iohn or Christs Disciples: Only they that did confesse sinnes, and confesse their Faith were baptized, *Marc. 1. 4. 5. Act. 8. 37.*

2. Because Christ commaundeth to make Disciples by teaching them: and then to baptize thē: *Mat. 28. 19. Ioh. 4. 1.* but infants cannot by doctrine become Christs Disciples: and so cannot by the rule of Christ be baptized.

3. Because if infants be baptized, the carnal seed is baptized: and so the Seale of the covenant is administr'd to them unto Whom the covenant apperteyneth not. *Rom. 3.* which is a profanation.

2. That Antichristians converted are to be admitted into
the true Church by Baptisme.

1. Because Churches are so to be constituted now after the defection of Antichrist, as they were first erected by the Apostles: But in the constitution of Churches the Apostles received in the members by baptisme: so: So must wee doe now.

2. Because true baptisme is but one: but the baptisme of Antichrist is not true baptisme, and so not that one baptisme of Christ: but all members of Christ must have true baptisme.

3. Because as the false Church is rejected and the true erected: the false Ministry forsaken, and the true reserved: So false worship, (and by consequent baptisme) must be renounced, and the true baptisme assumed.

A

AN

Richard Clifton.

AN ANSWER TO TWO ANABAPTISTICALL OPINIONS.
vidz.

1. That Infants are not to be baptized.
2. That Antichristians converted are to be admitted into the true Church by baptisme.

Although with great sorrow I am forced to vnderake this busynes against him that was deere vnto me: yet being therevnto provoked by the sending to me these two Positions with certayne reasons annexed vnder the Authours owne hand: I thought it my part (although the vnablest of many) to contend for the maintenance of the faith which was once given to the Saints. Iud. 3. And by the help of God to put a brief answer to these opinions, which by the Churches in all ages have bene and are condemned for hereticall: the practise whereof I could wish might never have befallen to any of myne owne country, especially to them that were partakers with me of the afflictions of Christ for the witnesssing of his truth. And chiefly vnto him, to whose charge both I and divers others had once purposed to have committed our soules had he not besides these broached some former opinions, both erroneous and offensive; wherby the truth (for which we suffer) is like to be the more blasphemed of the wicked & many hindered in our owne country, that shall heare thereof, of whom we had great hope that they would have walked in the same faith with vs. Notwithstanding for as much as I am informed, that the authour hath promised vpon the sight of his errors to confesse the same, I do the more willingly take vpon me this labour, praying the Lord to give a good yssue, to his glory, for his mercy sake Amen.

A reply

Mr Smyth.

A REPLY MADE IN DEFENCE OF TWO

truthes, viz:

1. That Infants are not to be baptised.
2. That Antichristians converted are to be admitted into the true Church by baptism.

These two truthes are by you, Sir, in your answer, intitled *Anabaptistickall &c.*

Rich: Clifton.

Sir, Whereas you iustify your two Positions to be two truthes, and so write your Reply, *A defence of two truthes*: And charge me with vsing of reproachfull speeches in calling them *Anabaptistickall*. Herevnto I answer, that your two Positions will no more prove two truthes, then Ieroboams two calves proved two Gods, as in my former answer I have shewed, and shall (by Gods grace) more fully manifest in this treatise following. Secondly, I deny to have vsed any reproach, by intituling your erroneous opinions, *Anabaptistickall*. But your self do sinne in calling euill good, and darknes light: thereby bringing vpon your self, that fearfull woe denounced by the Lord against such. *Esa. 5. 20.* If you repent not. 3. Whereas you blesse God that, *you are accounted worthy to suffer rebuke for Christs truth*, &c. I could wish me to know that my reproach shall light vpon myne owne head, &c. I could wish you did not reioyce in vayne, for there is a suffering for euill iustly deserved, as well as for the truth, *1 Pet. 2. 20.* The Iesuities some of them have suffered vnto death, yet had they no cause of reioycing therein, seing they suffered for their due desert. And so your opinions being termed, *Anabaptistickall*, for their vntuthes, can bring no true comfort vnto you in suffering for them, nor yet my reproach, (as you call it) any iudgement vpon my head, being warranted to give falsehood her deserved titles. *Gal. 3. 1. Phil. 3. 2. Gal. 4. 9.*

As for Christ and his truth which you say, *are by me euill spoken of*: it had bene lesse sinne in you to have stayed your pen from publishing of such slanders, vnlesse you could haue proved your Positions the truthes of Christ, which I am sure you shall never be able to doe.

A 2

Mr Smyth.

In your Preface you avouch that you are provoked to write, & therefore
ſhould ſo ſpeak: ſeing your conſcience telleth you did make the firſt queſt or motion
Mrs Bywater &c.

Rich: Clifton.

For Answer herevnto, know you Sir, and let all men take notice that
the thing which you charge me with is moſt vnttrue, for preſently after
you were fallen into theſe groſſe errors, came Mr Southworth & Mr Brom-
head two of your followers to my chamber (as they ſayd) in kindnes to ſee
me, and entered conference with me concerning theſe opinions, ſaying that
they had heard that I had bene endyned that way when I was in England,
with ſome perſwative ſpeeches to conſider of this your new walking ſay-
ing alſo, that you were willing to conferre with me, and did wiſh that ei-
ther I would come to you, or els if I were willing, you would take pains
to come to me; to whom I answered, that I never had any thought of
embracing ſuch opinions, neither was willing to have any conference with
you thereabout, which when they heard me ſo to ſay, they further did ſo-
licit me to write with you about theſe points, and ſayd, that you would
as willingly & as frendly write with me thereof, as you did in England in
our former conference concerning excommunication and other differences
then betweene you & me, offering if I would not beginne, that yet I would
vouchſafe to read and answer your writing; to whom I ſayd againe, that I
would not write firſt or require your writing, (for I thought not to have
any dealing with you,) yet being ſo importuned I told them that I would
be content to read it, if you ſent it me, but for Answer thereto I
promiſed none, onely I ſayd I would conſider thereof, and ſo do then as
I thought good. This was the ſubſtance of my ſpeeches to Mr Southworth
and Mr Bromhead, and of theirs to me. Now if this had bene true, that
I had provoked you by any former ſpeeches, it is very like they would have
made ſome relation thereof, eſpecially requiring that you might have con-
ference with me, neither need you to have ſent me word that you would
write or conferre (if ſo I pleaſed) and to deſire either at my hands (as
theſe men did teſtifie,) if I had before moved you thereunto.

But

between Mr Iohn Smyth & Rich: Clifton.

But for witness hereof you produce, *Mrs Dymmer* a gentlewoman that hath embraced your errors, with whom, after I had received your positions, which also she sayd she had seen I had I speak to this effect, that she would be carefull over her self how she entertayned your new opinions, affirming, that I was perswaded they were greivous errors, and prayed her briefly to stay a while vntil your positions might be answered, assuring her that I could by Gods help defend this truth we stand for against you, with some other words to like purpose.

Now let the indifferent reader iudge, if you have not greatly wronged me, to say that I did make the first request or motion of writing: nay your own act in writing first vnto me, & your own speeches in this your **Page 1.* book which are these: *Certaine reasons propounded to Mr Rich: Clifton, concerning certaine Propositions following*, as also your *admonishing vs to answer you, or els you will be counted as subtilly blind & leaders of the blind into the ditch*, do witness the contrary. And that this busynes comes of your self, though you seek to lay it vpon my back, let your owne conscience iudge: as for myne owne part, being so provoked, I could do no lesse then answer.

2. You charge me with perverting of this scripture, *Iude 3* and say, that *I am neither to plead for Baall, nor contend for Antichristian errors*.

And I answer, that these being truthes for which I contend, as have been proved sufficiently, and shalbe (God willing) as occasion serveth, more fully confirmed, then am I not guilty of any such imputation, but your self is become faulty in calumniating the ordinance of Christ, viz: the baptizing of infants, accounting it an Antichristian error, which I wish you well to consider of and not to adde sinne vnto sinne, both in pleading for error and in disgracing the truth and the professors thereof.

Further you say, it will not helpe me that these two truthes have bene condemned for heresie by the Churches in all ages, for if the Apostles afforded contrary to the succeeding ages that which is most iudicious is the truth: I graunt if you can prove, that the Apostles age affords contrary to the succeeding ages for the iustificing of these your opinions that then you have good warrant of your syde for calling them truthes: but if the Churches which have condemned your positions for error, have agreed herein with the holy scriptures then I say, the brand of heresie lies iustly vpon them. And whereas you alledge that many truthes wherunto we are come, have bene condemned for heretical, in as many ages as those truthes which you defende bringe out.

The proceſſe of the paſſages between

I answer that not many truths, if any which we hold, to my remembrance have bene condemned in the ancient Churches for heresie, and suppose those Churches did sayle in some things, (as every Church is subject to erre, yet followes it not, that therefore they erred in condemning your opinions for hæresie: some things I think you wil graunt are heresies which those ancient Churches succeeding the Apostles age did condemne, as those of Arius, Eutiches, Macedonius, and the rest: and then is not their iudgement so lightly to be passed over, that no reconing is to be made of what they have done agreeable to the scriptures. As for your errors we reject them not onely because the ancient Churches have so censured them, but finding them contrary to the word of God, therefore we condemne them.

3. Whereas I did feare your broaching of these and your former opinions, would be offensive, and to the hindering of the truth, this you passe over in presuming of the goodnes of your cause, saying, *if any be hindered from the truth, it wil be their sinne, but if you feare (you say) that, your Antichristian Church will fall to the ground, I say, it is that, which is appointed to perdition, and to perdition let it go.*

Indeed if any be hindered from the truth, by the publishing of the truth, it is their sinne, *Mat. 11. 6.* but if you which haue stood for the truth, shall now by publishing of error, cause the truth to be the more blasphemed, & give offence to weak professors, that is your sinne, and wilbe too heaue to be answered at the judgement day; if you repent not.

And as for our Church which you blasphemously call *Antichristian*, know you that I do not feare the fall of it, for it is built vpon the foundation of the Apostles & Prophets, Iesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone, *Ephes. 2. 20.* which hath a sure promise that the gates of hel shall not prevaile against it. *Mat. 16. 18.* And therefore your *Anathema* cannot hurt vs, but shall rebound back agayn whence it came.

4. You say, *though I haue professed to forsake myne errors, vpon their discovery, and as I have practised, for which I am reproached among your brethren, yet I never professed my readines to be perverted from the truth, which you call heresie, and therefore if you did undertake to write vpon this ground, you might well haue spared your paines and saved your self from so grievous a sinne, by pleading for Antichristian corruptions, &c.*

The ground of my perswasion concerning your willingnes to yeeld vnto

the truth, did arise partly from that persuasion which I had of your satisfaction, and partly from the speeches of the messengers before named, who did affirme unto me, that if I could manifest by the word of God, that it was error which you hold, you would acknowledge it: And still I may say if you be in error it is ** ignorantly*. And therefore desirous of ** Passages* your good, I did undertake according to my small abilitie to manifest *page 71.* the truth unto you, by such reasons as I could at that present gather for the confirmation of the same; which, seing you make so small account of, I answer me, that *I might have spared my paines and saved myself from sin,* I am sory in that respect that I did write, yet in regard of witnessing the truth and performing a duty towards a brother fallen into error, I repeat the not, neither yet of committing any grevous sinne thereby, as you charge me withall, seing I plead for that which is of Christs, and not for manichristian corruptions. And as for your errors so often graced by you with the title of *truthes*, which you say, you *never professed to be perverted fro,* I marvelle not greatly therat, for heresie is a work of the flesh, *Gal. 5. 20.* that is easily and quickly imbraced, but not so left, and herein differs from the truth; to the receiving whereof, we are hardly drawen, as both you and I had experience; but error drincketh as a pleasant potion, *Rev. 18.* without resistance, and bewitcheth many that they should not obey the truth, described and plainly manifest in their sight, *Gal. 3. 7.* the poison whereof I am sory hath so infected your soule, that you seeme to be changed into the nature thereof, and to be as confident therein as in any truth of the gospel: and though you account my praying to be *for an overthrow of the Lords truth*, which is in deed for the conversion of you and that deceived company with you, from your errors,) yet will I pray stil that God may open your eyes, if you belong to him to see your grevous fall, & glorifie the truth of God, which in this your writting so greatly you have disgraced.

Now I will come to answer the Positions with the reasons thereof, and first concerning the former which is this.

1. That infants are not to be baptised.

Touching this first position, that Infants are not to be baptised,
I read

The Proceſſe of the Paſſages between

I read that Auxentius one of the Arrians ſect with his adherents was one of the firſt that denied the baptiſme of infants, & after him Pelagius the heretique, againſt whome Auguſtine & others of the ancient fathers, have oppoſed and condemned for herefie, and that according to the ſcriptures, which by Gods grace we ſhall together with them alſo further manifeſt, & prove by ſound reaſons out of the word the lawfullneſ of baptizing infants, which firſt I will vntertake, and then answer the reaſons to the contrary.

Mr Smyth.

Now in the next place you make a ſpeciall preface to the firſt point, affirming that baptiſme of infants was denied by Auxentius the Arrian, & by Pelagius &c.

Rich: Clifton.

I ſayd that Auxentius the Arrian was one of the firſt that denied the baptiſme of infants, and then Pelagius, whom Auguſtine and others reſuted and condemned for herefie: and you answer thus, that one heretick condemned another, contrarie to the ſcripture for the truth ſake.

That Auguſtine was an heretick and condemned Auxentius for the truth contrary to the Scripture reſteth for you to prove if you can. I have already proved that the denying of Baptiſme to Infants, is an error, & you have not in all this your writing confuted the ſame as wil appeare in the answer. And here let it be obſerved that you acknowledge Auxentius & Pelagius to be hereticks, & ſo theſe your errors to have bene firſt broched by men juſtly condemned for herefie, for you ſay, one heretick condemned another.

Further concerning the fathers by me alleadged in the 6. page of my writing, to ſhew the praſtiſe of Churches in baptizing of Infants, you paſſe them over with this answer, ſaying, I can prove that Auguſtine, Cyrill, Cyprian, Origine, Naxianzene, Ambroſe and many others were as groſſe hereticks, (if he be an heretick that holdeth in herefie) as Auxentius and Pelagius, &c.

That theſe Fathers and others had their errors we do not deny, but that they were hereticks, and ſuch as did obſtinately defend their errors, being convinced therof by the word of God, is more I think, then you can prove: we do not ſay that the holding of every error makes an heretick: but when

concerning the baptising of Infants.

that holds an error and persisteth obstinately therein after admonition,
by that such a one is to be rejected, *Tit. 3. 10.* And though you could
show those fathers as grosse heretiks as Auxentius & Pelagius, as I know
you can not in that sense as the Scripture taketh this word *Heretike*, yet
the opinion of those Catabaptists is *not* thereby iustified, for as an heretique
may hold some points hereticall, so may he some truthe. And you are to
show that those fathers did vnjustly condemn Auxentius and Pelagius,
for the denying of the baptisme of Infants, or els you Answer not to the
purpose.

As for our acknowledging of the Auncient fathers to be *Antichristian*,
it is more then you have from me or can shew that I have so affirmed: in deed
in these tymes the churches were in declyning, and through ignorance and
error taking heede to the word, Sathan beganne to prepare way for An-
tichrist, but that we account them simply Antichristian as fallen into that
deepe Apostacy, we doe not; they had some Ceremonies and other obser-
uances that we approve not of, yet retheyned they many of gods ordinances
whereof Pædobaptistry is one: And where as you say it is *no more to be respected*
in the Ancient Churches then the Prelacy and read prayer in the same: we have lear-
ned by the word, to put difference betwene the things of God retheyned
in Churches declyning, and the inventions of men, though you cast out
both together & account vs Antichristian for the same: next you proceed to
examine my Arguments from the scripture, alledged to prove that Infants
are to be baptised.

I. OF THE FIRST POSITION
concerning the Baptising of infants.

Rich: Clifton.

Argument I.

Gen. 17. 10. God made his covenant to Abraham
and to his seed: from whence I reason thus.

That covenant which God made with Abraham he com-
maunded

B

to
Of the first Argument
maunded to be sealed to him and to all his seede, yea even to infants.

But the covenant that we vnder the gospel doe receive is the very same that was made to Abraham, &c.

Therefore that is commanded to be sealed to vs & to our seede, yea even to our infants, for so was that to Abrahams.

The Major can not be denied, see *Gen. 17. 10. 11. 12.*

The Minor is likewise as true, for the Apostle speaking of this covenant, *Act. 2. 39* sayth, the promise is made to you and to your children, and to all that are a farre off, as many as the Lord our God shall call. In which words it plainly appeareth that this is the very same covenant and promise that was made to Abraham, which they that were a far off, that is the Gentiles beleeving, doe receive and were baptised into. And therefore is Abraham called the Father of many nations, *Gen. 17. 4.* also *Gal. 3. 13. 14.* Christ is sayd to redeme vs from the curse of the Law, that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Iesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit, see vers. 8. 9. Now then if we be partakers of the same covenant, (for otherwise A B R A H A M S covenaut should not be an everlasting covenant, *Gen. 17. 7.* seing his posterity after the flesh is cut off for a tyme, *Rom. 11. 15. 17. 20.*) it must follow that the same must be sealed to vs, and to our infants, (els it is not the same) & that by the comandement of God. For the abolishing of circūcisiō, & the bringing in of baptismē vnder the gospell, doth not abrogate or disannul the commaundement of sealing the covenaut to the beleeving parents with their infants, which was once commaunded to Abraham, but onely sheweth a changing of the outward signe. And therefore as the covenant belogs to the Gentiles beleeving, so doth the scale thereof to them &

concerning the baptizing of Infants.

their seede, as it did to Abraham & to his seed: The outward ceremony onely changed.

Mr Smyth.

To this Argument I make answer thus: first distinguishing the two covenants or testaments (for a covenant & testament is all one in the originals though the English words are two): one covenant was made with Abraham and his carnall seed and of that covenant was circumcision a seale: another covenant made with Abraham and his Spirituall seed, and of that covenant the holy spirit of promise is the seale: for the carnall covenant had a carnall seale upon the carnall seed: the Spirituall covenant had a Spirituall seale upon the Spirituall seed. For things must be made proportionable, & circumcision which was a carnall seale, could not seale up the Spirituall covenant to the Spirituall seed, for to say so, is to leap over the hedge, and to make a disproportion against the type and the truth. &c.

Rich: Clifton.

Here you say that two covenants were made with Abraham, a carnall & *Gen. 17. 1. a spirituell, the one with Abraham and his carnall seed, the other with him and his 10. 11. spirituell seed: I answer, first, that God made with Abraham but one 4. 17. covenant of salvation, which is, That God would be his God, and the God of his seed. Gen. 17. 7. Luk. 1. 72. And this covenant was *sealed with cir- Heb. 9. 10. cumcision, and it is the same covenant that is established by the blood of Christ vnto all the faithfull seed sealed vnder the Gospell *Mat. 23. 19. in stead of circumcision. Other covenant that was given for salvation 19. to Abraham and his seed, the scripture knoweth none. In this covenant †Heb. 8. 1. is promised through Iesus Christ, remission of sinnes, iustification, life e- Jer. 31. 34. verlasting with all saving graces to all that beleve. And that this is so, Act. 13. 38. the Apostle doth witness, saying, * and thus I say that the covenant which 39. Heb. 9. was confirmed afore of God in respect of Christ, the law which was 430 yere after 15. 1 Cor. 13. 11. cannot disannull. Where it is to be noted, 1. that this covenant that was 30. Rom. 8. 1. given to Abraham was but one: 2. that it was in respect of Christ, & 4. 11. therefore was that spirituell covenant 3. that it was confirmed vnto him, *Gal. 3. 17. which is more then a bare offer.

B 2

Secondy,

Secondly, I deny that God ever made any carnal covenant
 with Abraham, or with the Israelites, seeing he made but two testaments
 all with his people, and both of them spirituall, the new Testament
 graunt to be spirituall, and that the old is so, the Apostle doth witnesse
 Rom. 7. ling the law (which is a part of the old Testament) both † holy and spirit-
 1. 14. all. This law covenant or old Testament God gave to Israel and they
 * promise to keepe it, and so were bound to the observation of a spirituall
 Exod. 19. and not of a carnal covenant. Besides this first Testament was not made
 with Abraham, seeing it can not be shewed that he or the fathers did
 Deut. 27. undertake the keeping thereof vnder penaltie of the curse, as † Israel did.
 1-26. And as for the promise of Canaan, which Abraham beleeveth that his seed
 should inherite, it was annexed vnto that covenant made with him in Christ
 1 Tim. 4. as saith the Apostle. that † *Godlynes hath the promise of the life present, and of
 that which is to come:* And therefore can no more be called a carnall cove-
 nant, or be said to be sealed with circumcision then the promise of the
 life present vnto vs, may be called carnall, or to be sealed with baptisme.
 And that circumcision was not given as a seale to confirme vnto Abraham
 and his seed onely the land of Canaan, (as you affirme in your answer to
 my second argument, Reason, 1.) but to seale vnto him and to his seed
 the covenant of saluatio; as may be gathered from that very place of Gen.
 17. 8. 9. Where Moses having set downe the summe of the covenaut that
 concerns Abraham and his seed, ver. 7. in vers. 8. repeates that promise
 of Canaan before made vnto him, Gen. 13. 15. and with all sayth, *I will be
 their God*, which is that spirituall covenaut here againe purposely repea-
 red; because he would shewe that the commaundement of circumcision,
 which followes in the next vers. was given for a seale thereof, ver. 11. And
 that it is so to be vnderstood, the spirit, (who knoweth the minde of the
 Lord) so expoundeth it; Rom. 4. 11. saying, *after he received the signe of
 circumcision the seale of the righteousness of sayth*, &c. by which place it is evi-
 dent that circumcision was a signe of the spirituall covenant made with
 Abraham, and not of an other different from this, called by you a car-
 nall covenant. The covenaut in Christ made to Abraham, was confirmed
 vnto him: Gal. 3. 17. and there is no mention of any other signe given vn-
 to him but of circumcision, ergo.

Again

if God gave circumcision to be a seale to Abraham and his seed, as you affirme, what had the Proselytes to do with this signe? were they to be circumcised, seeing they were not of Abrahams carnall seed? this signe could not seale vnto them the land of Canaan, who had no promise thereof; yet were they circumcised, *Exod. 12. 48*, therefore they were partakers of that covenant wherof circumcision was a signe; concerning Canaan it was promised onely to Abrahams seed after the flesh, and so you say, then must it needs follow that the Proselytes were partakers of the spirituall covenant, and so received circumcision as a seale thereof. And thus it is manifest that circumcision was no signe of any carnall covenant made to Abraham as you affirme.

That to Abraham was made but one covenant, the very phrase of the holy Ghost intimates so much, for in speaking thereof the scripture useth the * singular number; neyther do we read of any moe testaments or covenants but two, the old & the new, the former given vnto Israel in the wilderness a long time after that God had made his covenant with Abraham in the Messiah to come. ** Gen. 17. 4. 7. Gal. 17.*

Further you say, *that circumcision being a carnall seale, could not seale a spirituall covenant but the seale thereof must be the spirit.* &c. I require of you what you meane by a carnall seale, if you mind that circumcision is carnall, because of the cutting of the foreskinne, I graunt that there was a cutting of the flesh; or if you mean carnall because it was an external signe, who will deny it. But what is this to the purpose, for the flesh of Christ was lanced & pierced with nailes, yet for all that it was a spirituall sacrifice; and the sacraments of the new testament, be outward and visible thinges, yet are they signes of spirituall thinges: and so circumcision though it was externall & by incision of the flesh, yet was it a visible signe of an invisible grace, & of that spirituall covenaut made with Abraham. Againe, concerning your devised carnall covenant with circumcision, which you say, *is a type of the spirituall covenant and spirit*; I answer, that circuncision and Canaan, typed out spirituall thinges promised, but were not a carnal covenaut to type out the spirituall, which was already made with Abraham: neither doth the scripture teach us that God did make a carnal covenant with him and his seed, thereby to accept them to be his people, for that could not be by any other covenant, then onely by that in Christ, there being no reconciliation to God but in him. And although the spirit be the earnest or

† 2 Cor. 5.

19.

** Ro. 8. 15.*

16. 2 Cor.

1. 22. & 1

5. Gal. 4. 6

Eph. 1. 14.

pledge of Gods promises in our hearts, yet for the further strength and confirming of our weak faith, the Lord both before the Law to Abraham, and so vnder the Law, and likewise vnder the gospel hath to his venant annexed certayne outward signes as scales therof.

And thus you having set downe your distinction of two covenants, *Wish that they may be remembered and orderly applyed, and the argument say will appeare of no vaine &c.*

There can be no orderly applying of disorderly things, your distinction brings all out of order, and therefore this double covenant being denied and not by you proved, my argument stands firme in all the parts thereof. And the maior vnderstood of that spirituall covenant of God made with Abraham and his seed, the Minor is truly assumed out of the Maior, and so is no sophisme.

Furthermore the crosse of Christ hath not abolished the covenant made vnto Abraham but confirmed it, nor yet abrogated the sealing thereof lawfully changed the outward signe that thereby he might put some difference externally betwene the times of Christ promised to come, and his manifestation in the flesh, and accomplishment of his promise. And as we have the spirituall covenant and spirit, so had the faithfull vnder the law, and therefore it is false to say, that they had the carnall covenant and not the spirituall; typed by the carnall: for although vnder the Law the Lord did traine vp his people vnder many ceremonies which were types of things to come, yet did he never ordeyne any carnall covenant with a scale therof as you devise. But let vs see your proofes for all these particulars.

First, that there are two Testaments made with Abraham, you alledge Gal. 3. 16. 22. Gal. 4. 24. saying, *Agar, that is the old Testament, and Sarah that is the new, both married to Abraham.* 2. There are two seeds, *Ismael of Abraham and Hagar, who typed the carnall seed, and Isaac of Abraham and Sarah who typed the spirituall seed.* ver. 23. 3. There are two scales *circumcision a scale of the carnall covenant, upon the carnall children, Gen. 17. 11. and the holy spirit of promise a scale of the spirituall covenant upon the spirituall seed, 2 Cor. 1. 22. Ephe. 1. 13.* &c. First, for the place of the Gal. 4. whereon you build your carnall covenant, that nothing fits your purpose; for there the Apostle had to deal with the false Apostles, who urged the works of the law for iustification and taught the people that vnlesse they were circumcised Christ could not profit them, whom after he had confuted with diuers reasons, he inferreth to the same

concerning the baptising of Infants.

29

the allegorie of Abraham and his two wives, shadowing out there-
 fore there can be no agreement betweene the law and the gospel in
 manner of iustification, the law ingendring bondage & requiring strict
 obedience, without which is no salvation; but the gospel freeth from
 all bondage, and requireth to beleeve and so promisseth salvation;
 as Paul speaking to them that would be vnder the law, doth shew them
 foolish they are, which by the gospel are set free from the curse of
 the law and legall ceremonies; do frustrate that freedome, by subiecting
 themselves againe to the law, which could never make them righteous;
 but so become like vnto Ismael sonnes of the bondwoman; whereas all
 they that are vnder the gospel are free from all that bondage of the law &
 as Isaac sonnes by promise of Sarah the free woman. Now this being
 the purpose or scope of the Apostle, this allegorie setting downe the di-
 vers states of them that be vnder the law or old testament, & vnder the
 gospel or new testament, concerning iustification and salvation, doth
 further prove that these two covenants or Testaments were made to A-
 braham, or yet that the Iewes were so vnder the lawe, that also they were
 not free by faith in Christ, for if we consider the times wherein the law
 was given, 430 yeres after the promise; it will appeare that the law or
 old testament was not given to Abraham, or yet that it did disannull the
 covenant to dispossesse his seed of that estate which they obtayned, by that
 promise made vnto him. And it is to be noted, that aswell vnder the
 new testament as vnder the old, all they are in bondage with Hagers sonns
 that seek by the workes of the law to be iustified.

*Deut.

26.

†Ro. 10.

11. Rom.

16. 17.

*Aet. 13.

38.

†Aet. 13.

39.

*Gal. 3.

1. I answer more particularly to your proofes whereof the two for-
 mer are drawen from this place of the Galathians chap. 4. 24. the first,
 because the Apostle calls Hagar & Sarah the two testaments, vers. 24. and both
 were married to Abraham, therefore to Abraham were made two testaments.
 True it is that Hagar and Sarah were types of the two testaments, the one
 of the old, the other of the new. But the Apostle applies them, to set
 out thereby the different estate of them that be vnder grace from such as
 be vnder the lawe of works: Now to Abraham was not the lawe given
 (whereof Hagar is made a type) and therefore could not have that co-
 venant of the lawe sealed vp vnto him by circumcision, for sure I am moe
 covenants

Heb. 8.

covenants or Testaments the scripture saith is not of
& new; the one abrogated by Christ his coming, the other continuing.
And that the Apostle meaneth of these two testaments, it may be
playnely out of the text it self, for speaking of the lawe, he saith that
one which is Hagar of mount Sinai which gendereth vnto bondage, making
mention purposely of Sinai, because that covenant of works or law was
in that mountaine, whereof Hagar was a shadow, ver. 25. And
king of the other testament or covenant of grace, sayth, *but Ierusalem*
is above, is free. &c. ver. 26.—28. meaning that such as were children
of were free after the manner of Isaac. But here it is well to be minded
if these two Testaments be not one and the same, & be sayd to be two in
respect of the tymes and diuers administration thereof, and then your car-
nall covenant cannot stand.

Certainly the Lord made one eternal & vchangable covenant to his
Church, instructing and dispensing his benefites otherwise in the time of
the Law, then now he doth under the Gospel. And in this respect, the
Scripture speaking of one and the same covenant or Testament, may well
speak in regard of the dispensation therof, as of two. And so understand
by the old Testament, that spiritual doctrine of grace delivered by Moses &
the Prophets to the Fathers promising eternal life, openly under condition
of perfect obedience of the Law, & threatning of the curse if they did not
perform it; together with that intollerable burden of legal rites, & yoke of
Moses politie: and covertly, under condition of repentance & sayth in the
Messiah to come, prefigured under types, shadowes, & ceremonies: that
by this meanes the Iewes as by a Schoolmaster might be lead vnto Christ.
And by the new Testament understād the same spiritual doctrine of grace
now revealed by Christ & his Apostles, manifestly, without shadowes and
legal rites, promising righteounes & life to al, both Iewes & Gentils that
shal beleeeve in Christ already come.

And this being the meaning of the Apostle in speaking of two Testa-
ments in this place, this scripture serves nothing for your carnall covēāt,
seing both these Testamētts are spiritual; & though some carnal things wer
comāunded in the old testament: Yet those makes it no more a carnall
covenant, then water in Baptisme, & bread & wine in the Lords supper, &
the receiuing of them (which al are carnal things) do make the new Testa-
ment carnall, they being given to signifie vnto us spiritual things as were
those car-

the law ordeyned to like use, vnto the Iewes. *And* from this placeis, that there are two seeds *Issaack* of Abraham and *Ismael* of the carnall seed: and *Isaac* of Abraham and Sarah, of the spirituall seed.

Now this is the thistype that Hagar & Ismael did shadow, as Hagar was in bondage, and Sarah & Isaac were free, as the children of Jerusalem, which are the sonnes by promise, standing heere, not onely Abraham was vnder bondage, but through the obseruation of the law hee had for liberation. But all other whatsoeuer, that by pretending to observe the law, hope thereby to be justified, as by applying this doctrine to the Galatians appeareth. But you say, *Isaac* and *Ismael* typed the carnall seed after the flesh. All that the Apostle sayth is this, that he that was borne of the flesh, was borne after the flesh, meaning thereby that he was not borne by promise, as Isaac was, and so did type out the state and condition of them that seek justification by the works of the law, what you affirme more then this you must prove.

You say, there are two seales, circumcision a seale of the carnall covenant, and baptism a seale of the spirituall covenant upon the spirituall seed, *Expe. 1. 19.*

First, I deny that circumcision is the seale of any other covenant, but of that one covenaut made with Abraham in respect of Christ, which was confirmed vnto * him and to his seed, thereby also the same called circumcision a seale of the righteousness of faith.

And lastly, because Isaac that was borne by * promise, was circumcised, who was partaker of the covenant of grace, and of the righteousness which is by faith, therefore circumcision was a signe and seale thereof.

But you will object, that Isaac was of Abrahams carnall seed and in that respect received circumcision, as a seale of the carnall covenant, which he also had. It is true that Isaac was borne to Abraham after the comon course of nature, and therefore had he thereby this prerogative to be circumcised, which no other children had but Abrahams, vntil they or their parents were by faith partakers of the same covenaut made with Abraham: but it is not true that he received this signe of circumcision, as the seale of a carnall covenant or of the promise of Canaan onely: or that it was a

C

scale

Exod. 12. seale vpon the carnal children of Abrahams onely, beinge the beleeyng Gentiles (as before was obserued) and Ismael also was circumcised that had no righte. And all such as beleeeve & have received the gospel are sealed with the rit of promise, is true; but as the spirit doth not onely inuincibly promise of God in the hart of beleeyngs, but externally for the cheth the same. *Heb. 8.* so doth he inwardly & outwardly seale the same promise to them vnto whom it belongs.

1 Cor. 1. *spirit and circumcision are seales of the same covenant of grace & righteousnes of faith.

1 Cor. 1. And thus may you see, that your distinction of two covenants of two se-
1 Cor. 1. verall covenants, a carnal, and a spirituall is but a devise of your owne in-
1 Cor. 1. uention which will fall to the ground, when Pedobaptistry shall stand firm
1 Cor. 1. against your strongest reasons, though you hold it to have a landy founda-
1 Cor. 1. tion.

In the next place you answer to the scriptures by me alleadged, to prove the parts of my argument and first to that of *Gen. 17. 10. 11. 12.* you say, *Gen. 17. 10.* that circumcision was a seale of the carnall covenant made with the carnall flesh, and not a seale of the spirituall covenant made with the faithful for the spirit is the seale thereof.

I have answered you before, that circumcision was a seale of the spirituall covenant made with Abraham, and have proved the same by those places of *Rom. 4. 11.* and *Gen. 17. 7-12.* although you labour to infringe the testimony of the Apostle; saying, that it is not the scope of the place, but this, viz. that circumcision had one specialitie in Abraham differing from all other, that by circumcision he was sealed up to be the father of all the faithful, as concerning the matter of their iustification, &c.

The words of the Apostle are so playne, as you cannot shifft them off, for Paul proving that Abraham was iustified by faith, and that faith was imputed vnto him for righteousness when he was vncircumcised, sayth, after he received the signe of circumcision as the seale of the righteousness of faith which he had when he was vncircumcised, *Rom. 4. 9. 10. 11.* Doth not the Apostle plaine-ly affirme that circumcision was a seale of the righteousness of faith? which righteousness, what is it else, but the matter of Gods spirituall covenant made to Abraham? for Christ the substance of this covenant, is this righteousness by which Abraham and all the faithful are iustified; And you confesse that by circumcision Abraham was sealed up to be the father of the faithful

concerning the baptizing of infants

79

concerning the manner of their iustification. Now if it did seale to Abraham the
covenant, then is circumcision a seale of the covenant of salva-
tion, and not of a carnall covenant, as you affirme. And if circumcisi-
on was to Abraham of this heavenly promise, then is it so to all his
seed. For God put no difference in commanding him and his seed to
be circumcised, as to say to Abraham that this sacrament, should seale v-
erily the covenant of grace, and to his seed a carnall covenant, but
thus to Abraham, *† thou also shalt keep my covenant, thou and thy seed af-* *† Gen. 17*
ter thee in their generations. But say you, he was sealed up with the father of the faith- *9. 10.*
ful, that, as he was iustified by faith, so should they be, and that he also had circum-
cision in Abraham differing from all other.

That Abraham had this prerogative above others to be the father of the
faithful, is not denied, but to affirme that circumcision was not a seale
of the spirituall covenant, is false: and you answer not the Apostle, but
shift it off with saying, *this specialtie had circumcision in Abraham, differing from*
others, which is no consicionable dealing, seeing you cannot but know, that
Paul having affirmed that Abrahams faith was imputed to him for iustifi-
cation when he was vncircumcised, doth prevent this objection. *Abraham was iustified being vncircumcised,* to what end was he then circum-
cised? to which the Apostle answers, that his circumcision was not for
any wayne, but was given of God, and by him received as a seale of the righte-
ousnes of his faith, so setting downe the vse of circumcision, not limiting
the same as a specialty to Abrahams fatherhood, but as the proper end or
vse of the sacrament it self belonging to all others that were circumcised,
as well as to him.

The next scripture is Act. 2. 39. whereto you answer, *that the promise is* *Act. 2*
of to the impenitent Iewes, and to their posteritie, and to the Gentiles a faire off,
and that was exhibited onely to so many as yielded obedience to the faith, charging
us with adding to the text, &c.

First, I confesse the word *(made)* is not in that place, but added by
the translator to make the sense more plaine, the text may thus be read, *for*
as you is the promise, and to your children, yet the word *(made)* added in the
translation, is no adding to the sense, as may be proved, *Gen. 17. 2. 7.*
where in the second verse, the Lord vseth this word, *(give)* saying, *& I*
will give my covenant between me and thee,

C 3

and

and in the 7. verse, *I will make or establish my covenant*, the same word is also in vers. 21. in the giving of the covenant. This word *covenant* is a word equivalent vnto it, is vsed in Deut. 29. 14. *I will make a new covenant with you*, vsing a borrowed speech which signifies a covenant of living beasts and fowles. The same word is likewise in *Act. 13. 32.* the words are, *that touching the promise made in the fathers* which place the word *(made)* is expressed; so is it in *Act. 21. 6.* & *Gal. 3. 17.* And therefore though the Apostle leave it out in rehearsing the covenant, yet finding it in the originall graunt, and in other places, there is no adding to the word, if we expresse the same in our owne tongue. All which frees me from your sclander, of adding to the text. But if the reader will minde your writing, this imputation of adding will more iustly be returned vpon your owne head, for you say, *the promise is offered to the impenitent Jewes*. I desire it may be helued where this word *offred*, is in the text, and why you call those Jewes impenitent, which the holy Ghost witnesseth to be penitent.

Secondly, you not being able to answer this place of the Actes, posit it with a distinction of *offring and exhibiting*, thereby to deceive the simple in putting the thing promised, (which is offered to many by the preaching of the Gospell, but exhibited to the beleevers) for the covenant or promise it self, which was once made to Abraham and his seed; now Peters reason was to perswade them to repentance and baptism, because the Lord had made his promise to them and to their children: and they likewise had entred covenant with him to walk in his wayes, therefore they should amend and be baptised, & the Lord would pardon their transgressions. And note that salvation is offered by the preaching of Christ, continually to them that are within the covenant, as wel as to others.

But let me ask you whether that covenant which God made to Abraham was but onely offered, or that Abraham received it also, & so God both entred covenant with him and he with God? is it not apparat that Abraham received the covenant, in that he beleeved, and was circumcised? and did he not receive it as wel for his seed, as for himself & beleeved that God would be the God of his seed? how can you say then, it was but an offer onely. And if it was not made with the Israelites, how could

concerning the baptising of infants

21

they be blamed for the * breach thereof? they might have bene re-
 for refusing to have received Gods covenant being offred vnto
 but not for their adulterie, never being maryed vnto the Lord. *Isaell*
 *Lords wife, & he her husband, could this be by an offer, and not
 the contract? read *Luke*, 1. 68. - 74. but if it please you to read
 19. 10-15. where the covenant was renewed with *Israell*, that the
 women, and children and straunger with them, entred into the cove-
 and othe of the Lord, which he made with them; it will appeare that
 was more then a bare offer, for hereby God did establish them a people
 him self.

But, say you, it was exhibited onely to so many as yielded obedience to the sayth,
 I answere, these Iewes whom you call *impenitents*, many of them did repent
 and had received the covenant in *Abraham* their father, were circumcised
 and had right to the * promises, were to be esteemed † children of the
 covenant, vntil by infidelitie and impenitency they were cut off. And here
 you are deceived, that because many of the Iewes through infidelitie fell
 away, that therefore the covenant was not made with them, it is true, that
 did not profite the † ynbelevers, & that was their own fault (no more doth
 now profite hypocrites in the Church,) yet was it made with the, & they
 externally received it, in that they did partake of the signes therof, and pro-
 fessed to be *Abrahams* sonnes, *Joh*. 8. 33. The Lords supper offred, & ex-
 ternally received of the vnworthy, profits them not, yet they partaking
 but in the outward signes are held * guiltie of the body and bloud of *Christ*.
 Further you say, *Whereas you seeming to assume that the covenaut was made*
in Abraham and his infants, it is therefore made to vs and our infants, I saye that
the covenaut spirituall was made that is conferrd to all Abrahams Infants ac-
cording to the flesh, &c.

First, you deny that the spirituall covenaut was made, that is con-
 ferrd to all *Abrahams* infants. But I ask you whether was it given to any
 of them or no? because you say, it was not conferrd to all, if to none, I pray
 you tell me how any of them, so dying infants were saved? so also you
 say, neither is it conferrd to all our infants, can you shew me which of our infants
 are except, if it be not conferrd vnto all. That it was conferrd or made
 on the Lords behalf, cannot be denied: but that every one to whome it is
 conferrd doth effectually receive it, who doth so affirme? you runne here

to the secreete counfel of God, where in, all are not
 144. because they are the seed of Abraham, the which is not denied, but
 the posterity of Abraham after the flesh, many were not of the
 11. but this is not to the purpose, for we do not hold that every one of
 ham's naturall seed is saved, nor all the posterity of beleeving parents
 in the electiō: but this we beleeve, that God of his free grace gave
 venant to Abraham and to his seed, and he by sayth received the same
 himself and his seed indefinitely, as we also doo beleeve that God will
 our God, and the God of our seed, because he hath so promised, and there-
 fore doo we in assurance hereof cause our Infants to be baptised according
 Mat: 28. to the* cōmandement of Christ: if any of them cōming to yerres do ma-
 nifest by their vnbeleef, that they are reprobate, then are we to take notice
 Jo: 2. 19. that they were not of vs, but till then we are to account them as children
 of the Covenant, as well as we do those that being hypocrites, do outward-
 17. 8. 13. ly professe the sayth & so are baptised, as Symō Magus.

Secondly, you say, *The spirituall covenant was offered to all Abrahams seed
 vnder the carnall &c.*

How Gods covenant was geuen to Abraham and his seed, & not bare-
 ly offered, I have shewed before, so also have I answered to your carnal
 covenant and confesse, that the Lord vnder types & figures did teach and
 Heb. 8. 5. shadow forth vnto Israell diverse particulars of the Messiah as of his sacri-
 9. 8. 9. ficing, death, resurrection, Priesthood and such like, and of good things to
 10. come to his Church vnder the Gopell, and of the Kingdome of heaven, but
 &c. Col. that there was a carnal covenant or Testament made with Abraham over &
 17. Heb. besides the covenant of grace, sealed vnto him and his carnal seed by cir-
 9. 9. & cumcision all your learning can never prove it.

chap. You cōclude *That, as it was offered to Abrahams seed, so 10 ours.* This I hope the
 Cor. 10. if it be proued that the spirituall covenant was not onely offered, but
 1. 6. geue to Abrahams carnall seed (I meane the Israelites) that the same cōvenāt
 is giue to our childre, vnlesse the grace of God be lessened vnder the gospel.
 to proue the former, viz: that the spiritual cōvenāt was giue to the Israelites
 besydes that which hath bene formerly observed I will add some few rea-
 sons moe to confirme the same.

I. Deu: 29. 10-15. Moses speaking vnto all Israel, sayth, *ye stand*

every one of you before the Lord your God, your heads of your tribes, your
and your officers, all the men of Israel, your children, your wives &c. that
shouldst passe into the covenant of the Lord thy God, and into his oth
he maketh with thee this day, &c. neither make I this covenant with you
but with him that standeth here with vs this day, as with him that is not here
this day, &c. Which covenant is the same that was made to ^{Dent. 2}
Abraham, and renewed both on Gods behalfe and the peoples. Now that ^{13. conf}
covenant that God confirmed to Abraham, with an othe is the covenant ^{with Gen}
made as Luke, 1. 72. 73. confers with Gen. 22. 16. Hab. 6. 13. 14. And ^{17. 1. 2}
the covenant that was made to Abraham, is the very same that Isra- ^{19. &}
renewed with the Lord, for themselves and their posterity, ^{Dent. 19. 13. 3.}
which was not barely offered, but confirmed unto Abraham & his
by the Lords oth. Yea in verse 10. 12. it is sayd, ye stand this day to passe
the covenant of the Lord, and into his oth which he maketh with thee this day, for
to establish thee this day, a people unto himself, and that he may be unto thee a God as
he hath sayd unto thee, and hath sworn unto thy fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Ja-
cob. And this to be their God, & they to be his people, & their
posterity, was no carnall covenant, but the very same that is made with ^{2. Cor. 6}
us under the Gospel. ^{16.}

3. That the Lord made with Israel his spirituall covenant, may al-
so be proved, *Dent. 10. 16.* where Moses exhorts them to circuncise the
foreskinne of their hart, and by all these exhortations of the Prophets, to
repentance. *Ier. 3. 14. & 4. 1. 4. & 7. 3. Hosea 10. 12. and 14. 1-7. Joel*
2. 12. 13. Amos 5. 4. 6. Zepha. 2. 1. 2. (which are the conditions of that
spirituall covenant that the Lord requires on our part therein) & the
promises of pardon annexed therevnto. (which is the other part of the
covenant on Gods behalfe.) Now the covenant of the law admits of
no repentance, nor promisseth any pardon, onely the covenant of grace,
admits thereof. If therefore they had not had the spirituall covenant
given vnto them, wherevpon could the Prophets have grounded their ex-
hortations, or with such reasons have perswaded them to repentaunce?
This was the ground of Peters exhortation of the Iewes to amendement
of life, as before is observed out of *Act. 2. 38. 39.*

And

And by the Lords requiring of repentance at the hands of the Iewes, it is most cleere, that God required then the same thing, that now in the Gospel is required of vs: Ergo they were interested in the same covenant that we have: And therefore not onely the outward obseruation of ceremonies was required of the Iewes, by their covenant, but also the obseruation of the conditions of the covenant of grace, as to walke before God and to be vpright: *Gen. 17.1.* to beleeeve and repent: And it is a notable argument to hold the contrarie.

3. Israel were held to be the people of God, and the Lord to be their God, and so God did* account of them. Now I would know if they could be sayd to be his people, and not to be within his covenant of grace; doth God accept of any by a carnal covenant to be his people, and not in Christ? do not both Iewes & Gétiles become Gods people through Christ? and all that are not within his covenant, are sayd to be * far of and without God. But the offering onely of the Gospel or covenant, makes not a people to be Gods people, for the Gospel may be preached to them; that are without, but then are they sayd to be Gods people, when they embrace his covenant and not before, and such as do receive it are commanded to separate themselves from the prophane, which wil not have the Lord to be their God: which separation, argues a difference between a people to whome the promises are offered, and such as have received them for that Gospell that converted some in a false Church, was offered to moe yet is it received onely of the faithfull, in which respect they are sayd to be the people and Church of God. This resteth then for you to shew that God intituleth any to be his people, which have not eyther themselves or their forefathers received the covenant of grace. And as Israel was called the people of God, because the * covenant belonged vnto them, and they had passed into that, & received the seale thereof whereby they testified themselves and were acknowledged to be Gods people and sheep of his pasture: so are we become the people and Church of God, not because the gospel is preached vnto vs, but because we have received the promise of God, and entred covenant with him for our selves and also for our children, for if the * first fruites be holy, so is the whole lump, and if the roote be holy, so are the branches.

4. The Apostle sayth, that the branches; vz. the Iewes were* broken off from the roote and farnes of the olive through unbeliefe meaning by the roote, Abraham

And Jacob their forefathers who for themselves and their seed received the covenant: Now it must necessarily follow upon the Apostles words, that they were before, of the olive, or els could they not be broken of: And this breaking of, was not a ceasing to be their small seede, (for so continew they stil) but they were broken of from the covenant of grace made to Abraham and his seed, as it is apparant by this, that they were broken of through vnbelief, which hath relation to that covenant, and not to the covenant of works. Yea and they are sayd to be broken of from that, whereinto we are grafted by faith, and into which they may also be grafted in agayne, if they continew not in vnbelief. Now we are grafted into no other covenant but that of grace: And as for the Iewes they cannot againe be grafted into such a carnal covenant as you imagine, being by your owne doctrine it is disannulled: And if they be to be grafted into an other covenant and not the same that they were in before, how can it be called a grafting in agayne? for this phrase importeth a covenant whereof they had bene formerly partakers.

But it will be objected, that they which are once in Christ and holy, cannot be broken of, and therefore such of the Iewes as fell away, cannot be sayd to be holy and of the spiritual covenant.

Answer first, it is trew that they that are grafted in Christ, and personally holy "cannot be broken of: secondly, the Apostle speaking of holynes and saying if theroot be holy se are the branches, meaneth not of any personal holynes, but of that right of the covenant whereby they became Gods people, which he calleth *holynes* that descends from Abraham to all his seed, as the sap or fatnes of the olive doth from the root ascend to all the branches; And this holynes, or right to the spiritual covenant had all the Iewes, in regard whereof they were separate from all other nations, and called a holy nation. And in this respect are the children of those parents (whereof the one of them beleeueth) called holy, 1. Cor. 7. 14. not that personall holines descendeth from the parent to the childe (for that cannot passe from one to an other) but because through the fayth of the father beleeving that the promise of saluation is made to him and his seed, the children have now title and right to the same covenant by the free and large promise of the grace of God, and so many as are elected are saved (though dying in their infancy,) by the same covenant.

5 The Apostle affirmeth *Act. 15. 11.* that both the fathers under

D

SoD omg the

*Rom.

19. 29.

†vers. 23

19. 29.

27. 28.

the law, as well as we that are under the gospel, are under the same *ing and sanctifying grace of Christ, saying, wee beleue through the grace of Lord Iesus Christ to be saved as they*, meaning their fathers, *vers. 10.* whereon I conclude, that their fathers being under the same grace, were under the same covenant with us, although this grace was not so fully revealed and fulfilled as it is now * to us; for there is no participation of the grace of justification and regeneration, but in this spiritual covenant; therefore to them was given this spirituall covenaut, and they did receive it as well as we, though amongst them some particular persons did by their personal vnbeleif, cut themselves off from the grace of God, as now some do with us, which neyther then, nor now, can make the covenant given to our forefathers, to be void to their posteritie.

6. The spiritual covenant that was given to Abraham and his seed, was before given to " Adam, and the fathers to the time of Abraham; & they received it by faith, (for there is but one covenant of salvation both before & after Christ, & one maner of receiving it, which is by faith:) & Abraham to whom was promised the land of Canaan, did notwithstanding look for a * citie having a foundation whose builder and maker is God. And of these fathers before Abraham his time, doth the Apostle witness *that they all died in faith, * saw the promises (that is the things promised) a fier off,* (though they received them not as then fulfilled,) *and beleued and received thankfully and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrimes on the earth, for they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country; that is an heavenly.* And in the first epistle to the Corinthians chap. 10. 1. &c. the Apostle speaking of the fathers which were of Abrahams seed, sayth, *I would not have you ignorant, that all our fathers were under the cloud, were all baptized unto Moses, did all eat the same spiritual meat and did all drink the same spirituall drink, for they drank of the spiritual rock that followed, & the rock was Christ.* By which scriptures it appeares that the spiritual covenant was given unto them, & that they received it by faith.

7. If the fathers under the law had not bene within the covenant of grace, all their worship offered unto God could not have been acceptable, seeing out of Christ, * God is not pleased with any person, or with any worship; therefore is he sayd to be the Lamb slayn from the beginning of the world, & the onely " Mediator between God and man, by whom we have access unto the Father, and † through whom all our sacrifices and worship are pleasing unto God.

Lastly, it must needs be that the Iewes had the covenant of grace, seeing the Apostle sayth " *that the Gentiles shalbe coinheritors* (meaning with the Iewes)

concerning the baptising of infants.

27

of the same body, and partakers of the promises in Christ by the Gospel: for if the
Iewes had not formerly bene a body & inheritors of the promises in Christ,
how could the Gentiles be sayd to be coinheritors with them and of the
same body, see also Ephes. 2. 12. 13. 14. Add hereunto that the Iewes
were called the *children of the kingdome, and of of the " covenant, and
unto whom the † promise was made.

* Mat. 12.

" Aft. 13.

25.

† Aft. 13.

32.

And now it being proved that this spirituall covenant apperteyned to
the Israelites, and the conditions therof required at their hands, I hope you
will grant as much to the saythfull and their seed under the Gospel, or els
show vs where and when the hand of Gods grace was shortened, but
that I am sure you cannot prove God to be lesse bountifull now, then he
was to the Iewes: and therefore as the children of Abraham Isaac and Ia-
cob were holy and had right to the covenant and were sealed with circum-
cision: so are the children now that descends from beleeving parents *ho-
ly, and have right to the covenant " and kingdome of God, and conse-
quently to baptisme the seal thereof.

* 1 Cor. 14.

" Mat. 14.

14.

But you say, *Infants wanting actuall faith, cannot truly be sayd the children of Abraham.*

I answer, that actuall faith is required of such of Abrahams children, as
are grown to yeares. And therefore you must proove that infants wanting
actuall faith cannot be the children of Abraham, and then must you prove
that they are not Christs, for if they be Christs they are Abrahams seed
Gal. 3. 29.

Here

that actuall

faith in

this treatise

is put for

actuall use

faith.

" Mat. 14.

" Aft. 14.

14.

But are that they are, in secrete to the Lord; Whatsoever they are.

Christ hath sayd playnely, " that. of such is the Kingdome of God. And the
promise is * made to the beleevers and their seede. And you leave them
in secrete to the Lord, thus shutting your eyes against the cleare light of the
truth.

" Mat. 14.

" Aft. 14.

14.

The Scriptures following, (viz: Gal. 3. 13. 4. 8. 9. compared with
Gē. 17. 7. Rom. 11. 15. 17. 20. which serve most playnly to prove that the
covenant that we have is the same that was made to Abraham,) you leave
unanswered.

Next follow your reasons against paedobaptistrie, the first wherof is this.
*As it was with Abraham the father of the faithfull, so must it be with the children of
Abraham, Rom. 4. 11. But Abraham first beleeved actually, and being sealed
with the spirit of promise, after ward received the signe of circumcision: Ergo the childrē
of Abraham, the beleeving Gentiles must first beleeve actually and be sealed with the
spirit of promise, and then receive the baptisme of water.*

This Argument which you alledge against Pedobaptistrie the very serves to confirm it, for thus we reason for it observing your termes.

As it was with Abraham the father of the faithfull, so must it be with the children of Abraham.

But Abraham first beleaved and being sealed with the spirit of promise, afterward received the signe of circumcision, he and his children.

Ergo, the children of Abraham the beleaving Gentiles must first beleave and be sealed with the spirit of promise, and then receive baptisme of water, they and their children.

Here let the reader consider, yf you by this your owne Argument have not yeilded the cause; for this is that which we stand for, viz: that, As it was with Abraham the father of the faithfull so must it be with his children the beleaving Gentiles. Now Abraham beleaved that God would be his God and the God of his seed. Gen. 17. 7. received circumcision the

seale thereof, he himself, and all his males, yea Isaac of eight dayes old. Ergo the children of Abraham the beleaving Gentiles must first beleave, and then receive the seale thereof which is Baptisme, themselves and their children. But if your meaning be this, that as Abraham beleaved first &

after was circumcised; so every one of Abrahams seed must first actually beleave and then be baptised, then I must intreat you to shew me when and where this difference was put between the seed of Abraham which descended from him by the course of nature, & his seed that are of the Gentiles, that the former being infants, might notwithstanding first receive the seal before they did actually beleave: And that the other, viz: the infants of the Gentiles must first beleave and after receive the signe: surely before the coming of Christ the Lord put no such difference, but that such of the Gentiles as did turne to the faith, their infants were circumcised, as well as the infants of the Jewes. After Christs comming the Apostle witnesseth, that

there is no difference between the Gentiles and the Jewes, for he sayth *the Gentiles are coinheritors also (meaning with the Jewes) and of the same body and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel. And therefore the Apo-

stle did not doubt to baptise the households with the beleaving parents. I will answer you therefore with the words of the Angel unto Peter, *The

things that God hath cleansed pollute thou not. God hath purified the Gentiles, and our seed in accepting us into the same covenant with Abraham, there-

It is an injury offered, to pollute; that is, to reject from the covenant, our children, whom the Lord hath received. Your second this.

As in the old testament the carnal children were carnally circumcised and so admitted into the Church of the old testament: so in the new testament, the spirituall children must be spiritually circumcised, and then be admitted by baptisme into the Church of the new testament. But the first was signified by the type, Ergo the second is signified in the truth.

First, If this Argument should hold proportion, then it would follow, that as circumcision was a seale of the covenant, so should baptisme be a seale likewise; for it is brought in here to answer circumcision, as the door into the Church. But you deny * Baptisme to be a seale of the covenant.

I answer that the carnal children of the Israelites were not admitted to be members of the Church of the old testament, by circumcision: for they were borne in the Church and so were of it before the right day, & the covenant apperteyned unto them, and therefore were they circumcised, for none might be circumcised to whom the covenant did not belong.

Also to the Majors consequent, I answer, that they which enter into the Lords covenant be they beleivers or their Infants, we are to hold them spiritually circumcised, and therefore to be partakers of baptisme.

Concerning your assumption, as * repentance and profession of faith is required of them that are to be adjoynd to the Church of the new Testament: so was it of Abraham, and of them that were Gentiles, and to be adjoynd to the Church, of the old Testament, And therefore this manner of admitting members into the Church being morall vnder the law so continueth to be vnder the Gospell. And the Circumcision of the hart was commanded and promised then to the Israelites and their seed as we know it is to us, and not onely to them that adjoynd to the Church, but continually to all the members of the same. And therefore it is not true that theirs was the type onely and ours the truth: seeing the things signified by Circumcision were required of the circumcised; as the thing signified by baptisme is also required of vs; and a like entrance into the Church vnder both Testaments.

The third is this: As in the old Testament carnal infants were carnally beotten and borne by the morall seed of generation by their carnal parents, and then were carnally circumcised, & received into the carnal covenant: so in the new Testament

* Church
pag. 9

"Gen. 17

† 1 Cor. 7

14. Lu

15. Jer. 1

* Mat. 3

8. Act

12. 37.

* Gen. 17

Esa. 6.

* Mat. 1

16. Lu

17.

30. 6.

30. 6.

30. 6.

30. 6.

30. 6.

30. 6.

30. 6.

30. 6.

30. 6.

30. 6.

30. 6.

30. 6.

30. 6.

Spiritual Infants new borne babes in Christ must be spiritually begotten and receive the immortall seed of regeneration by spirituall parents, and then being spirituallly circumcised, they shal by baptisme with water be received into the new Testament. But the first was signified by type, Ergo the second was verified in the truth.

This reason is a like to the former and hath answer already. This I add further that circumcision though it was a cutting of the fore skinne of the flesh, yet was it an holy action† sealing vnto the beleevers and the seed, the righteousnes of faith.

2 I deny that the seed of Abraham after the flesh was by circumcision received into a carnall covenant; the covenant is spiritual vnto which they were sealed* by circumcision, as before I have proved: for had they bene received into a carnall covenant; then should the Church of the old Testament be also carnall: for according to the nature of the covenant so must the Church be; and G O D must be a carnall G O D, and delighted with carnall things, contrary to Psal. 50. 8. 13. Esay. 1. 13. 14. But the Lord required of his people the Israelites more then outward or carnal service and that which stood in ceremonies types and shadowes, even tholynes, the circumcision of the hart, * repentance, " the service of the hart and soule. And that the Lord did principally require spirituall worship of them, appears by his† rejection of their ceremoniall worship when it was offered vp without the spirituall, and by exhorting to the spiritual; as Psal. 50. 14. 15. to offer praise and to call vpon him, and Psal. 4. 5. to offer the sacrifice of righteousnes, and in Hoseah. 14. 2. to pray for pardon, and to render vp the calves of their lips, And consequently faith in Christ; without* which, all their worship was vnflavory to God. the Psal. describeth the true members of the Church and dwellers in the Lords† Tabernacle not by an outward obseruation of legall ceremonies, but of their spirituall obedience. The Lord sayth " my faith give me thy hart, and reproveth† hipocrisie. By all which testimonies it is manifest, that the members of the old Church were received into a further covenant with the Lord, then into a bare carnal covenant which hath carnal conditions onely, as before is proved.

The fourth is this, *If the carnal infants in the old Testament were circumcised then the carnal infants in the new Testament must not be baptised, because that as circumcision is abolished which was the signe or seal; so the infant is abolished which is the subiect of the signe or seal. And a proportionable infant introduced, which is one regenerate by the spirit and by the word: But the carnal infants in the old Testament were circumcised: Ergo the carnal infants are not now in the new Testament to be baptised.*

The consequent of the major wil not follow, the reason proves it not. For although circumcision be abolished in that there was one

was typical, as the circumcising of the males onely, whereby they were directed vnto Christ by whom our corrupt nature is cleansed: yet was not abolished as it was a seale of the covenant, but the outward ceremony onely changed: no more is the carnal infant of the beleeving parents abolished or made vncaple of the seal of Gods covenant: for the children of Christians † are Abrahams seed, I say, not in respect of the flesh, but by force of the covenant comprehending the whole seed of the faithfull; and therefore have right as well to the signe of the covenant as had the carnall seed of Abraham.

† Gal. 3.

Towching your proportionable infant (as you term him) it is to be observed that in the old Church it was required of al that were to be adioyned herunto that they should *separate from the filthines of the heathē to seek the Lord as now it is vnder the gospel. And therefore it wil not follow that circumcision was a type onely of the time to come? the fift is this.

* Exod. 13.
48. & 21.

As in the old Testaments when the male appeared the eight day their was a painful circumcising and mortifying of the foreskin when the party was received into the covenant actually: so in the new testament when the Lord Iesus Christ (typēd by the male) cometh thar when there is a painful circumcising & mortifying of the superfluous foreskin of the hart, the party so qualified should be received into the new testament actually. But the first was signified by the type: Ergo, the second is verified in the truth.

First, the covenant to the infants of the Iewes was actually sealed by circumcision, but this cānot properly be said a receiving into the covenant, (when they were before comprehended with their fathers,) but a confirming therof to the parties circumcised. And this appeareth to be so by the Lords threatening to *cut of from his people the vncircumcised male-child. Can he be cut of that was not of his people, or for the refusing circumcision to be sayd to have broken the Lords covenant?

* Gen. 17.

2. Your simile holds not proportion, for you say, the party circumcised was by circumcision actually received into the covenant, then by your reason (if you will make it proportionable) the parties that are to be received into the new Testament, must be received therein by the mortifying of the superfluous forskinne of his hart; or els you must shew some ceremony following circumcision, by which the Iewish children were received into the covenant that must type out baptisme by which, say you, the parties so qualified should be received into the new Testament actually, or els shew a reason why this ceremonie of baptisme is added to the truth (as you expound it) and nothing added to the type to shadowe out baptisme? this is not proportionable that there must be a ceremonie added to the truth in receving in of members into the Church now since the coming of Christ, and not any to the type in receving in of members into the Church before his coming.

Lastly if you will keep proportion, you must compare together circumcision and baptisme, both which do lead to the circumcision of the heart: are the scales of one and the same covenant, the one appointed for the old Church before Christ, the other for the Church under the Gospel, & then will your Argument fall out against your self. And thus I have shewed both the weaknes of your answer, & of your reasons grounded thereupon.

Argument. II.

Col. 2. 11. 12. If circumcision belonged to faithful Abraham and his seed, yea to such as were but infants, then doth baptisme also appertayne to all beleivers and to their seed being infants. But the first is true, Gen. 17. 10. Ergo the second.

The consequent will follow, seeing baptisme cometh in place of circumcision sealing up unto us and to our seed the same promises that circumcision did to Abraham and to his seed, Col. 2. 11. 12. and that in as large and ample manner (if not more ample) then to the Israelites, for of them onely were the males circumcised, but by baptisme, are both males and females sealed. And this must follow necessarily, or els the covenant by the coming of Iesus Christ should be more restrayned, then it was under the law, who came to ratify and confirm it wholly, as the Apostle sayth, 2 Cor. 1. 20. The promises of God are in him, yea and Amen, &c. For God gave it with the scale thereof, to Abraham and his infants: and if Christ should give it untous onely and not to our infants, this were to lessen and infringe the covenant, and not to confirm all, but to take away part of that which God before had given.

Mr Smyth.

I answer that this argument is built upon the same false ground with the former a meer mistaking of the covenant, and scale, and seed: and there is manifest violence committed upon the scripture by perverting and wresting it to false consequents: first therefore I deny the consequence, and I give reasons of my denyall. &c.

The former Argument is proved to stand upon a true ground and so it be manifested that there is no mistaking, eyther of the covenant, or seed in this reason, nor yet any violence offered to this scripture, by wresting it to false consequences as you affirme. The consequence you say, but desprove it not, to your reasons I wil answer particularly, which number are three.

Your first reason because, *that circumcision did not appertaine to Abraham & his infants as a seale of the everlasting covenant but of the externall temporary covenant of Canaan and of obedience to the law of Moses.* &c. I have already proved the contrary, both out of Gen: 17. 7. 9. where it is added as a *signe* vnto that everlasting covenant, and also out of Rom: 4. 11. where it is called the *seale of the righteousness of faith*. Furthermore, circumcision did signify the inward circumcision of the hart; which was not required of them in respect of the promise of Canaā, (the same being required vnder the Gospel,) nor yet of the law, (for it admits of no repentance,) but as a condition of the everlasting covenant made with Abraham and his seede in Christ: also the profelites & Ismael were circumcised, that had no promise of Canaan; nor right to one foot of inheritance in it, for * Canaan was devided by lot to the 12 Tribes, and in every tribe to the severall families: and therefore their circumcision did eyther seale vnto them the spirituall covenant, or none at all, as before is observed.

Againe, if by the male circumcised; Christ was typed, as you have affirmed before in your fift reason in your answer to my former Argument, then circumcision was a signe of the spiritual covenant: (For Christ is that which was promised). And if the infant circumcised was a type of him, it most nedes followe that circumcision was a signe of that covenant whereof the child circumcised was the subject, but the infant in becomming a type of Christ, became in this respect, a subject of the spiritual covenant, and therefore his circumcision a seale thereof, for the type and truth must have relation to the same thing or covenant.

Lastly, Christ was a Minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises unto the fathers. Rom. 15. 8. Also I deny that circumcision was first given as a seale of obedience to the law of Moses, seeing the law was not given when circumcision was ordeyned, but * 430. years after: the thing to be sealed is to go before the seale, or els it is preposterous, and the seale without fruit. Neyther was it given to be a seale of a carnall promise: in deed Abraham receiving the covenant of grace, God together with it promised unto him and his seed the Land of Canaan: but he never appointed circumcision to be the seale thereof; els when Isra-

† Deut.
16. 10.
Act 7.

* Ios. 14.
16. 17.
19. 21.

* Gal. 3.

el possessed that land, circumcision should have ceased, as all Sacraments shall do, when the promises, whereof they be seales, shalbe fully accomplished: and circumcision should have bene of no force to them that had no right to Canaan, which yet were circumcised.

Your second reason, *because the beleivers do not occupy Abrahams place in the covenant of the new Testament, &c.*

Ans. 2. 39 I answer, they do thus occupy the place of Abraham, that as he did, so do * they receive the covenant to them, and their children, who through the free promise of God received by the faith of the parents, have entrance into the covenant together with them: and in this regard parents are, & so may be called " fathers of their children, being the meanes whereby they come to this prerogative, And this is not to supply that particular of Abrahams fatherhood, which was extraordinarie.

Your third reason is, *because the infants of the faithful doe not possesse the place of the true children of Abraham, but possesse the place of the typical children of Abraham according to the flesh, &c.*

First, how the infants of the faithful are the children of Abraham, I have shewed, & here, deny that the children of Abraham according to the flesh onely as you mean, were types of the infants of the faithfull; seing the children of the Profelytes were the children of the faithful: and they were not the seed of Abraham according to the flesh, yea some infants circumcised, should be types, (as the carnal seed of Abraham) and other infants circumcised as well as they, (to wit) the children of the Profelytes) should be no types: for you say *the infants of the faithful do possesse the place of the typical children of Abraham according to the flesh.* And thus your owne reason agrees not with it self, nor you with the truth.

Secondly, I ask you if the children of Abraham according to the flesh were not the children of the faithful? Paul sayth, **that all our fathers were under the cloud, were all baptised unto Moses and did all eat the same spirituall meate, & drank the same spirituall drink &c.* And in the Epistle to the Hebrewes, cap. 11. the faith of the fathers is commended, and after the enumeration of many particulars, the Apostle sayth, *all these through faith obteyned good reports.* Which scriptures do prove that the infants circumcised were the children of the faithful, & if infants of the faithful, then were they types of themselves.

3. These that you call typicall children of Abraham, as Isaac, Iacob, &c.

WIT

concerning the baptising of infants.

35

are the true children of Abraham, Heb. 11. 9. all the posteritie of Iacob were children of Abraham after the flesh, & * sonnes of the promise of life, to be reputed, as the like we are to esteeme of all the children of beleevers.

* Rom. 16. 17. 18.

But say you, If you wil make true consequents, you must reason from the type to the truth, and not from the type to the type, neyther must you confound the covenants and seales as you do, &c.

20. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44.

And I answer you, neyther must you devise other covenants and seales then the Lord hath appointed. But as for my confounding of the covenants and seales, that is your bare affirmation, and what you have sayd for establishing of your two covenants or Testaments made to Abraham, & for your carnal and spirituall infants, is answered before.

Next you proceed to examine the reasons of the consequence of my argument, and of the scriptures produced for the confirmation thereof. And yet you deny baptism to come in place of circumcision as a seale of the same promises to us and our seed, then you undertake to prove the contrary, saying, That the circumcision of the hart succedeth in the place of circumcision of the flesh, Rom. 2. 29. and circumcision made without hands, cometh in place of circumcision made with hands, Collos. 2. 11. compared with Ephe. 2. 11.

By this reasoning you deny the fathers before Christ to be circumcised in hart, and yet to them as well as unto us was commanded and promised the † circumcision of the hart, and the hart of their seed, as before is shewed, and they had the grace together with the outward signe, & therefore your reason is insufficient, and the scriptures you pervert from their true meaning.

† Deut. 10. 16. 10. 17.

Towching the place of the Romaines, 2. 29. the Apostle having convinced the Iewes of syn, vers. 17. — 24. they might object, what doth our circumcision nothing profit us, that thou equallest us to the sinners of the Gentiles? yea sayth he, if thou keep the law, els thy circumcision is made uncircumcision: vers. 25. And so preferreth uncircumcision keeping the law, before circumcision transgressing the law, vers. 26, 27. then by distinguishing between such as are true Iewes and hypocrites, & the inward and outward circumcision, sheweth who is a true Iew (not before men) but before God, viz: he that is one within, wherein is no guyle, And that circumcision is awayable to salvation, which is not onely outward but of the hart:

Rom. 2.

E 2

this

this is the Apostles meaning, and not to teach, that *the circumcision of the heart* succeedeth in place of the *circumcision of the flesh*, &c. as you affirm.

3. 11.

That other place, Col. 2. 11. maketh no more to your purpose then the former, for the Apostle in that chapter dealeth against false teachers that urged the Jewish religion to be ioyned with the gospel, in this verse he denyeth that we have need of the *circumcision of the flesh*, (which was specially urged) seeing we are inwardly circumcised by the vertue of Christs death, and withal teacheth that our baptism is a most effectual pledge, seal, and witness, of our inward renewing, or regeneration; therefore having baptism to confirme these graces vnto them, need not the use of outward circumcision. And as for Ephe. 2. 11. the Apostle having before taught that they were saved by grace through faith not of works, verses 8. 9. 10. applyeth the same doctrine to the Ephesians, shewing that they were not onely as the Jewes, by nature corrupt, but also after an especiall manner, *strangers, & without God, &c.* and therefore ought so much the rather to remember the same to move them to greater thankfulness. And thus you may see how unfitly you haue alledged these scriptures.

4. 2. 11.

And *circumcision the seal of the flesh* hath the *holy spirit of promise*, which is the *spirituall seale* to succeed in place thereof. Ephe. 1. 13. 14.

4. 31.

Although circumcision was set in the flesh, yet was it not a seale of the flesh, but of the * spirituall covenant: and the holy spirit of promise succeedes not in place of circumcision as you understand it: for the believing Jewes had both the spirit inwardly sealing up unto them, that heavenly covenant of salvation; as they had circumcision sealing the same outwardly: as in Abraham, Isaac, Iacob and the rest: yea, the spirit in the Proselytes went before circumcision, for they being converted were after circumcised: Abraham before he had the outward seale was inwardly assured by the spirit and confirmed of the certaintie of the promise. But to prove that the spirit of promise succeedeth in place of circumcision, you quote Ephe. 1. 13. 14. which scripture is misalleged; for the Apostle intendeth to shew that the Ephesians were equall to the Jewes, because they were called by the same gospel, which they imbraced by faith, and sealed up by the same spirit, which is the earnest of our inheritance: And not to teach that the spirit succeedeth circumcision. Again the spirit being invisible, is not given to us for a visible seale of the covenant.

Rom. 4.

21. 22.

Further you say, I deny that the baptism of water is the seale of the new testa-

ment.

concerning the baptizing of infants.

37

though I cannot deny that the Baptisme of the holy Ghost is a seal. I say therefore that the seal of the spirit must go before the baptisme of water, and as all the ordinances of the new testament are spiritual and yet visible, so is the seal of the new Testament, spiritual, and yet visible, and thereupon men being visibly sealed by the spirit, as Cornelius company was, *Act. 10. 47.* may challenge the baptisme with water, as Peter there teacheth. This visible seal of the new testament is confession, as in the old testament circumcision was their confession, and baptisme is not a seal, but a manifestation of the seal.

First, you deny a principle of religion, and that which formerly you held, for in your book of Difference, &c. pag. 3. you call both breaking of bread and baptisme seales of the covenant: these are your words. The publishing of the covenant of grace and the putting too of the seales is onely one communion &c. for the publishing of the covenant giveth being to the seales, or herwise breaking of bread and baptizing are but putting of seales to a blank. And thus unstable are you in your ways.

2. What if baptisme be not called a seale? yet if it can be proved by scripture that it is a seale, we ought so to receive it. The sacraments given of God unto the Israelites were called seales, as circumcision by the Apostle is called *a seale of the righteousness of faith*. And when God made with Abraham his covenant to be his God and the God of his seed, he gave him circumcision a signe thereof, which did confirme unto him and to his seed that which God did promise, as before the Lord had done to Noah to who he gave the *rayn-bowe* as a signe of his promise, that the world should be no more destroyed with water: so the Passcover is called a signe, *Exod. 13. 9.* Now if circumcision be a signe and seale of Gods covenant, as the Apostle testifieth, then it must needs be granted that baptisme succeeding circumcision is also a seale of the Lords covenant, though the very word (*seale*) be not expressly set downe in the scripture. And this the Apostle intimates, *Act. 2. 39.* where he exhorteth the beleivers to be baptised every one in the name of Iesus Christ for the remission of sinnes, *for the promise is to you and to your children*. The Lord commanding his Gospel to be preached to all nations, commanded them also to be baptised, confirming by this outward signe, his covenant to all the beleiving Gentiles and their seed, as he had done to Abraham and his seed the same covenant by circumcision.

† Rom. 4. 11.

* Gen. 17. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19.

* Mat. 23. 19.

E 3

Paul,

- Act. 9. 17 *Paul, †Cornelius, "Lydia and the Gaylor, after they beleeved and had received the covenant were baptised, which confirmed unto them the true
 Act. 10. *forgiveness of all their synnes by the death of Christ. And this is plainly taught us by Peter 1. Epistle 3, 21. where he sayth, *that baptisme now al-
 Act. 16. so saveth us:* Baptisme cannot be sayd to save, as any cause thereof, but in this respect, that it witnesseth and sealeth unto us from God, our sal-
 Gal. 3. 3. vation, that which circumcision did type out to come, the same doth bap-
 Gal. 2. 38. tisme now signifie to be fulfilled in Christ the true † seed, of Abraham. And
 Rom. 6. 3. as by "circumcision the righteousness of faith was sealed: so by Baptisme
 Gal. 3. 16 salvation is sealed, as Christ sayth **he that beleeveth and is baptised shall be saved.*
 Rom. 7. 11 Againe, Rom. 6. 3. Paul sayth, *all we that have been baptized into Jesus*
 Gal. 3. 16 *Christ have beene baptized into his death.* In which words the Apostle giveth
 vs to understand, that by baptisme, the benefits of the death of Christ are
 on the Lords behalf confirmed unto us. And if this be not the significa-
 tion of baptisme, let it be shewed out of the word what els is minded by
 these phrases, *baptised into the death of Christ, and buried with him, by baptisme in-
 to his death?*

Thus have I shewed that baptisme is a seal of the new Testament, which you deny, affirming a new kind of seale thereof, viz: *Confession*, & say, *the seale of the spirit, must go before baptisme.* Which two in my understanding differ farre one from another, for *confession*, is the act of man, as the Apostle sayth, **with the mouth man confesseth unto salvation*, & proveth sometime to be hypocriticall, as that of Symon Magus was: But the baptisme of the holy Ghost is an action of God, and is eyther an internall work of the spirit, as Mat. 3. 11. or els external, by some visible signes and extraordinary gifts, Act. 1. 8. & 2. 2. 3, 4. and 10. 44.—47. This latter now ceaseth; being then given of God, for the further confirming of the Gospel in the Churches newly planted, until the faith of Christ was fully established amongst the Gentiles, and therefore is no ordinary seale of the new Testament given by Christ to be continued unto the end of the world, though I confesse those extraordinary gifts of the spirit, miracles & works done by the Apostles and other of the servants of Christ, have still their use in the Church to confirme the truth of God by them published.

And

And as for mens confession of the faith, that can be no seale of the Testament; because it is imperfect, and oftentimes hypocriticall, man falling away from the truth which formerly they professed, as Demas, Nicholas the Deacon, and those mentioned in the first epistle of Iohn, chap. 2. 19. Now that which must seale Gods covenant unto us, for the confirmation of our faith must be certayne and perfect, and that from God, because it is he that promisseth salvation to all that beleeve, therefore it is he that onely can give assurance of his owne covenant, And as for our confession, it is but an outward testification of the grace of God shewed upon us, it can no more be a seale of the new Testament, then the profession of the Iewes was of the old. And as you require of me where in all the scripture baptism is called a seale? so more justly may I demand of you where in all the new Testament that confession is called a seale. Besides if confession be a seale of the new Testament, then a man may be partaker of the seale, that is not of the Church, as they that confesse their faith and yet are not admitted members of the communion of Saints.

3. That the seale of the spirit must go before the baptism of water, &c. Understanding it as you do (of confession) then I graunt, that such as were never of the Church, at first to make confession of their faith, & to testify their repentance before they can be admitted members of the Church and be baptized. Act. 8. 37. 38. but neyther is such confession required of their infants, neyther is it a seale of the new Testament, as before I have proved. Otherwise understanding the seale of the spirit, as the Apostle doth, Rom. 8. 15. 16. & Ephe. 1, 13. 14. so goeth it before and together with Baptisme in all the elect of God whether infants or of yeares.

As for that sealing with the spirit, of Cornelius company, which you instance, Act. 10. 47. whereby you seeme to understand, confession, you cannot but know, that the spirit which came upon Cornelius and his company by the hearing of Peters words, was the extraordinary giving of the spirit, wherewith he and the rest were indued, and not onely the ordinary confession of the faith required of each true beleever, as by the text is plainly to be seen, which sayth, that, they of the circumcision were astonished as many as came with Peter, because on the Gentiles was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost,

for

For they heard them speak with tongues. And chapter 11. 13. Peter sayth, as I beganne to speak the holy Ghost fell on them, even as upon us at the beginning. Now A^ct. 2. 3. 4. it is written concerning the Apostles how the holy Ghost came upon them, viz: there appeared unto them cloven tongues like fyre, and it sat upon each of them, and they were filled with the holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the spirit gave them utterance. This descending of the spirit upon the Apostles was extraordinarie, (for he came not so upon all that were baptised, A^ct. 8. 36, 37. & 16. 14. 15. 33,) seeing *the multitude was astonished wondred all and marveyled. Therefore that comming of the spirit upō Cornelius and his company, was extraordinary: for Peter sayth, The holy Ghost fel on the me as on us at the beginning: also Peter distinguisheth between the holy Ghost that fel on them, & baptisme; for he seeing them partakers of the spirit, sayth, can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptised that have received the holy Ghost as well as we?

This visible seale of the new Testament, (say you) is confession, as in the old Testament, circumcision was their confession.

That confession, is not the seale of the new Testament I have already proved. And as for circumcision to be their confession in the old Testament, thus farre may be granted, that it was a signe separating them from the Gentiles, and whereby they were known to be Gods peculiar inheritance, and so is baptisme now to us, a signe distinguishing us from Jewes and Pagans, but as we do not only confesse the Lord to be our God by our baptisme; but also by *professing of his name and truth: even so did the Jewes confesse the Lord to be their God, and his truth not onely by circumcision, but also † with words to his praise. And I make no question, but the Profelytes before they were "circūcised made confession of their faith.

Baptisme is not a seale, but a manifestation of the seale.

I pray you Sir, of what seale is baptisme the manifestation? Confession you say, is the visible seale of the new testament. Doth it manifest our confession? it needs not, for that is visible. If you meane that it signifyeth the inward grace, it is true, but thereby we are assured of Gods promise, and so is the visible seale thereof.

Next you proceed to answer unto the scriptures which I alledged to confirm the consequence of my Argument: the first whereof is, Collos. 2. 11. 12. to prove that baptisme cometh in the roome of circumcision, this you deny so to be construed, and say:

That,

concerning the baptising of infants.

41

That the Apostle teacheth the verue of Christs circumcision and baptisme which is mortifying and burying of syn and resurrection from sinne, and not to teach in the new Testament baptisme succeedeth circumcision, &c.

That baptisme succeedeth circumcision as a seale to the same covenant of grace wherof circumcisiō was the seale, I wil further manifest & prove both of this place of the Collosians, and also by other reasons. First as touching Col. 2. 11. The Apostle reasoning against ioyning of legal ceremonies with the Gospel, proveth that the Church stands no need therof, seeing they are fully furnished with all things in Christ: and because the aduersaries did especially urge circumcision as necessarie to saluatiō, he answereth, that neyther needed they to be circumcised, because they were spiritually circumcised. And whereas the Collosians might have objected, that they that were under the law were inwardly circumcised, yet had they withall outward circumcision the seale thereof, which if we want, our state is not so good as their was: yea sayth Paul that it is, for in stead of outward circumcision, you have baptisme ordayned of God to seale vnto you and your children, under the Gospel, the same things that circumcision did seale vnto the Iewes and their seed: this is the meaning of the Apostle, and therefore it is truely gathered from this place that baptisme succeedeth circumcision: Now I wil prove also by other reasons that Baptisme succeedeth Circumcision as a seale of the same covenant.

First, the sacraments of the new Testament have the same end & scope in respect of the thing signified, with the sacraments under the law. For as Paul attributed the same vertue, efficacy, and effect of our baptisme & the Lords supper * to the fathers: so doth he ascribe to the beleeuers under the gospel, the efficacy of the † Pasceall lambe, and circumcision; therefore in respect of the thing signed, there is no difference, the same Christ, was the Lambe * slaine from the beginning of the world. Also the same instrument and meanes of application, the same † faith, end and effect, one and the same righteousnes of faith, the same † blessing with faithfull Abraham, the same spirituall circumcision of the hart, both of the fathers under the law and of vs vnder the gospel: so that in all these things there is no difference; which plainely argues, that our sacraments succeed in place of the former sacraments.

2. This may be further shewed by comparing circumcision and baptisme together in their special vses and ends, There is the same principal

use and end of circumcision and baptisme, viz: to * be signes of the covenant of the righteousness of faith in Christ: both of the sacraments of regeneration, "requiring repentance and mortification, both signifying that we are corrupt, and by the *g* blood of Christ, to be cleansed, by both of them such as were * without, were received into the communion of the Church. And by both of them Gods people were † discerned from other prophane companies: And neither of them might be iterated. By which proportion and agreement we may see, that the one follows the other.

Lastly, as circumcision was given as a signe of the covenant, when the Lord chose Abraham and his seed to be his people: so baptisme was given together with the publishing of this covenant to the Gentiles, when circumcision was to cease, the partition wall removed, and both Jewes and Gentiles were made alike partakers of the covenant and of baptisme the signe thereof. Which argueth that the mind of the Lord was to give to his Church, Baptisme, to confirme unto it, those things which before he had witnessed to Abraham by circumcision. And thus I have proved Baptisme to succeed Circumcision, and so answered your mistaking of that place of the Collos. 2. 11. 12.

Again you say that I would insinuate a restraint in the new Testament if baptisme be not due to infants; seing circumcision was due to infants in the old testament, whereunto you answer many wayes, saying,

1. Seing Baptisme doth not succeed Circumcision; this allegation is nothing to the purpose. 2. seing baptisme is both to male and female it is larger then circumcision which was onely upon the male. 3. Seing baptisme is both to Jew and Gentile therefore more large, then circumcision, but these things are almost nothing to the purpose: but now I say more pertinently, that the covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ, is now as large as ever it was, for it was never made with Abraham and all his carnall children, but onely with Abraham and the faithful, and so that continueth in the same tenure stil, and it is enlarged now since Christs coming onely in respect of the clearer and more universall publication of it, &c.

Concerning the first particular of your answer, I have already proved Baptisme to succeed circumcision, & then my allegation is to purpose you cannot

concerning the baptizing of infants.

43

not deny. To the second, I answer, that though baptism be both to male and female, and circumcision onely to the male, yet is not the seal of the covenant so large under the gospel as under the law, if infants be excluded from it: for though women were not circumcised, yet were they comprehended in the covenant with the males, and their state was as if they had been circumcised. Gen. 34. 14. And though baptism be to women, yet denying it to children, it makes a restraynt: for to place women in the stead of children is not an enlarging, but a change.

To the third particular of your answer, *that baptism is both of Iewe and Gentile, and therefore more large.* I answer, so was circumcision to Iewe and Gentile, for all the Gentiles might have been circumcised, if they had professed the faith: therefore it will follow that you do restrayn the seal of Gods covenant by denying it to infants.

But these things, you say, are almost contrary to the purpose: therefore to your second answer, that you say, is more pertinent, viz: *that God never made the spiritual covenant with Abraham and all his carnall seed, but onely with Abraham and the faithful.* It is certaine that God made his covenant with Abraham and his seed, Gen. 17. 7. and to that seed of his to whom was promised and given the land of Canaan, to that seed did God promise to be their God: but to Abrahams natural seed was promised and given the land of Canaan, Ergo to them did God promise to be their God & so made with them his covenant of grace in Christ then to come. The same may be seen by the $\dagger$ renewing of this covenant, as formerly hath bene shewed.

*Gen. 17. 8.

$\dagger$ Deut. 10. — 13.

I affirme, *that circumcision was never a seal of Gods covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ, &c.*

I have proved the contrarie before, and have also shewed that the confession of beleevers under the Gospel is not the seal of the new Testament, then is it not so large as circūcisiō: for that infants were circūcised, but Confessiō is onely of them that are growne to yeares. As for your opposing of true beleevers, to the carnal Israelites circumcised, it is not a iust and equall opposition, for actuall beleevers are onely of persons growne to yeares, but the circumcised were not onely of such, but also their infants. And thus you lessen both the covenant and seal thereof, if things be taken in their due proportion, though you pretend the contrary, deceived by your owne devised definitions and distinctions.

"pag. 12

Of the second Argument

24 Lastly, to 2 Cor. 1. 20. you answer, saying, this place is shew'd to be proving thereof; for the meaning of it is that. unto the faithfull, all the Lords promises are verified, but his promise was never, that all their carnall seed should have baptisme as a seale of life and salvation, but that all beleivers should have the spirit of promise which is the new Testaments seale.

You grant that the meaning of this scripture is that all the Lords promises are verified to the faithfull, and further then this I do not streyne it; but do affirme, that this promise of life in Chrillt, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed* * was made to faithful Abraham and his seed: which promise he received that he should be the father of circumcision, and the father of all that beleive, not being circumcised, Rom. 4. 12. 11. But where you say the promise was never that their carnall seed should have baptisme as a seale of life, I answer, that those whom you call carnall seed, being the infants of the faithfull, are a † holy seed, in respect of that title and right which they have to the covenant received by their parents, though they be carnall, inasmuch as they are begotten and born of them after the common course of nature. And therefore being holy, and children of the covenant, have also a right to Baptisme, as hath beene, and shalbe further proved in the residue of the arguments following. Here also out of your answer you set downe five arguments against Pædobaptistrie.

1. If all the carnall infants of Abraham were never actually under the everlasting covenant in respect of the actuall possession of it, then they never had title to the fruit of the everlasting covenant. But all the carnall infants were never actually under the everlasting covenant in respect of the actuall possession of it, seeing Abrahams children according to his actuall faith were onely under it. Rom. 4. 11. Ergo, &c.

I answer, unto the major, that to be under the everlasting covenant, is to be considered two wayes, 1. according to the Lords externall dispensation, thereof, who of his free grace " maketh his everlasting covenant with the faithfull and their seed. 2. according to Gods secret election; in the former sense, all the carnall infants of Abraham were, and all the infants of the faithfull are, under the covenant. * For if the root be holy, so are the branches: And therefore as the infants have right to the covenant, through the free grace and large promise of God: so have they † to the fruit thereof, which is administred by the commandement of God, according to the outward dispensation of his covenant, and not after his secret election, according to which election, neyther all the carnall infants of Abrah-

concerning the baptising of infants.

45

* 1 Jo.

† 2 T

19

or all the seed of the faithfull, or yet all that make * visible profession of their faith, and stand members of true Churches, are under the covenant, save onely the elect. But thus to vnderstand, to be vnder the actual possession of it, as it is proper onely to the true children of Abraham, to the certaine knowledge thereof † belongs onely to God. And thus you see the majors consequent, in a right understanding of the covenant doth not follow.

Your second is this, *If Baptisme doth not succeed circumcision, then Baptisme doth not pertaine to carnall infants.* But Baptisme doth not succeed Circumcision, because the seale of the spirit is correspondent to the typicall seale of the flesh, and Baptisme with water is onely the manifestation of the seale. *Ergo, &c.*

The consequent of the major of this argument is not necessarily true, for though baptisme should not succeed circumcision, yet may it pertaine to the naturall children of beleevers by vertue of the commandement of God. But I deny the minor, and do affirme that Baptisme doth succeed circumcision, as I have formerly proved. The reason of your assumption is also before disproved, for the spirit as you vnderstand it, for our consecration, is not correspondent to circumcision, seing infants are excluded.

Your third is this, *If circumcision did not seale up the everlasting covenant to Abraham and all his carnall infants (then by your proportion) baptisme doth not seale up the everlasting covenant to the faithfull & their carnall infants. But circumcision did not seale up the everlasting covenant to Abraham and all his carnall infants, Ergo, &c.*

The Assumption is false being rightly vnderstood, viz: in respect of their outward standing; and the contrarie is proved before, to wit, that circumcision did seale up visibly the everlasting covenant to Abraham and all his seed. Gen. 17. 7. &c.

Your fourth is this, *If beleeving Parents do not stand in Abrahams roome to conueigh the covenant to their infants, then though they be baptised themselves yet their children shall not.* But the beleevers do not stand in Abrahams roome to conueigh the covenant to their infants, for no man is the father of the faithfull, as Abraham was, and he did never conueigh the everlasting covenant to his carnall infants, *Ergo, &c.*

For conueighing of the everlasting covenant, this is that which we say, that it is conueighd to the children, by the free grace and disposing of the Lord, who giveth his covenant both to the beleevers and to their seed,

F 3

And

And although the believing parents stand not in Abrahams rowne to be the father of many nations; yet stand they in Abrahams rowne in this, that as * God did conveigh his everlasting covenant by Abraham be-
 17. 7
 12. 39
 17. 14
 11. 9. leaving to his seed: so dooth the Lord conveigh this covenant, to the chil-
 dren of believers: for this is common to Abraham with all the faithfull,
 To believe God to be their God and the God of their seed; and thus entred Abra-
 hams carnall seed, (as you call them) into the everlasting covenant, as before
 is proved. And be it that all their seed are not within Gods election,
 (yet leaving secret things to the Lord) we are to beleve the promise to be
 established to all our seed indefinitely, and not to put difference, before the
 time, that they by their works do manifest that they are not the true seed
 of Abraham: Amongest them that confesse Iesus Christ; and "are mem-
 bers of the visible Church many depart away, yet we account them childre
 of the covenant untill their hypocrisie be discovered: and so in like man-
 ner are we to esteem of the infants of the believers as * holy, untill the co-
 10. 2.
 17. 7. trary appeare.

Your fifth argument is this: *If infants of the faithfull do not occupy the place of true believers children of Abraham: but onely occupy the place of carnal children, then although the true children of Abraham in the actual believers be baptized, yet the infants shall not which cannot beleve actually.*

But the infants of the faithfull do not occupy the place of the true children of Abraham: seeing the children of Abraham do the works of Abraham; John 8. 39. Which infants cannot do. Ergo, &c.

First, it is denyed that the infants of the faithfull do onely occupy the place of the carnal children as you vnderstand it; for they are also the chil-
 17. 3. 32
 14. 3. dren of the covenant; and of the Kingdom. Secondly, the consequent of the major (according to the true meaning of the termes therein used) is also denyed, the contrary is proved before, viz: that infants are to be baptised though they have not the actuall use of sayth. To the minor I answer, that children so far as we can see do occupy the place of the true children of Abraham, for to *them is the promise, and in that respect children of Abraham, as hath been sayd.

Your reason drawne from Iohn 8. 39. to prove that infants do not occupy the place of true children, is not truly gathered from that scripture, for Christ there proveth, that the Iewes living wickedly were not the chil-
 17. 2. 29
 17. 29.
 11. dren of Abraham as they pretended to be; seeing they did not the deeds of Abraham: and he speaketh to men of yeares, of whom the practise of
 faith

is required. Now to apply this against infants of whom God requires such works, is like as if one should reason from 2. Thes. 3. 6. that because children cannot work, therefore they must not eat. And such is your absurd reasoning from this place. Now when children of believers do come to yeares to manifest their infidelitie by their works, we accordingly to iudge of them, after the example of Christ, and not before. Thus much to your five reasons, whereof not one is of weight to prove that infants ought not to be baptised.

Argument III.

Marc. 10. 13. 14. & Mat. 19. 13. 14.

They that are of the kingdome of God have right and title
to all the holy things thereto belonging, and may participate
of so many of them as they are capable to receive.

But the infants of believing parents are of the kingdom of God. Therefore the infants of believing parents have right and title to all the holy things thereto belonging, and may participate of so many of them as they are capable to receive and consequently of baptism, seeing they are capable of it.

The major Proposition I think will not be denied, it is written, 1 Cor. 3, 21. 22. All things are yours, Rom. 9. 4.

The assumption is Mat. 19. 13.—17. For of such is the kingdome of God, meaning that his kingdome stood not onely of such as being of yeares that beleaved, but also of their infants. And this he declareth not onely in this saying, but also by his displeasure against his Disciples for hindering their comming unto him: also by commaunding to suffer them to come, and by putting his hands vpon them, and blessing them. Mat. 19. 13. 14. 15. For would Christ have blessed them that were not of

his kingdome: or do not the blessings apperteyne onely to the children of the kingdom, even to the seed of Abraham, Gal. 3. 8. 13.

If it be objected that children are not capable of baptisme, I answer, they are as capable thereof, as the infants of Israel were of circumcision, being both partakers of the same promises with them, and in all respects as capable of the outward seales of the covenant as they were. And therefore the infants of beleevers are to be baptised.

M. Smyth.

To this Argument of yours I make answer diversly: First you have not proved that the visible Church and all the ordinances thereof pertain to infants of the faithful: for the infants of the Jewes that were presented to Christ were not infants of beleevers &c.

Rich: Clifton.

You answer, (you say) diversly, but yet your answer would have been more direct and playne to my understanding if you had denyed either proposition or distinguished; in stead whereof you demand divers questions; deny the sequels of the conclusion, and pretend absurdities to follow; notwithstanding I will answer to your particulars.

And first, where you say, I have not proved that the visible Church, and all the ordinances thereof pertain to infants, &c. I have proved that which I undertook, viz: both the parts of my argument, and you deny neither, but say I have not proved the conclusion, which if the Argument be in mood and figure must necessarily follow upon true premisses,

Next you say, the infants that were presented to Christ, were not infants of beleevers for ought that I see, &c.

Neyther have you any likelihood to judge the to be infants of any others that were not either of the Jewes or Proselytes: for would Christ receive the infants of the unbelieving Gentiles, and to say of them, of such is the kingdome of God? therefore it cannot be that they were the children of unbelievers, unless we shall imagine that Christ did practise contrary to the course

with set downe for the receiving of them, into his covenant that are without, also this was in * Iudah by the far syde of Iorden whether the people resorted unto him againe after he was come out of Gallily, And though the text mention not who they were that brought the infants to Christ, nor whose they were (as it was not needful for vs to know) yet by the circumstance of the place and persons comming then vnto him, it cannot otherwise be thought, but that they were of the children of the Iewes or profelytes; and as for your likelihood to the contrary, it is no likelihood at all, seeing the Disciples sayled in many things: "they also besought him to send the Cananitish away, yet he received her. Now the cause why the Disciples would have had the Canaanite sent away, was for that she cried after them, and it may be this was the reason why the disciples rebuked them that brought the infants, because they troubled them, or it may be they thought infants uncapable of knowledge and so could not profite by the word preached, but this matters not, for by Christs reproof of them, it is manifest that they erred in so doing: & that they ought not to have forbidden children to have bene brought vnto him.

You say, *it may be they were the children of some of the Romane soldiers or some Cananish persons.*

So it may be the parents of these infants were profelytes and most likely they were Iewes: but what is this to the purpose; answer to the argument, for this is but to seek shifts when you cannot find a sufficient answer. But suppose (say you) *they were children of the Iewes how is it proved that their parents were beleevers, seeing the Iewes for the most part were stiffnecked and uncircumcised in hart.*

Although some of the Iewes were stiffnecked, yet how is it proved that these were the infants of such? seeing many of the "people beleeved in him: nay rather the contrary appeares by * their comming to heare Christ and the bringing of their infants vnto him, that they were not of those that were stiffnecked, for would they have sought to Christ to bless their children if they had despised him? And although the parents of these infants might be such as yet were not fully instructed that the Messiah was come whom they looked for, (the contrarie is more probable) yet did they profess the Lord to be their God whom they ought to worship, & therefore were in externall account, beleevers and members of the Church,

If they had been the children of beleeving Jewes that were baptised by John & Christs disciples, &c

Whether these Infants or their Parents were baptised by John or Chr. disciples the scripture mentioneth not, neither is it greatly material for us to know, els the spirit had reveyled it: that they were blessed of Christ there is no question. But say you, *if they were baptised what need was there to bring them to Christ, except it were for popish confirmation.* The Scripture sets down the end why, viz. that † Christ should lay his hands on them, and pray for them, or blesse them. The laying hands on the partie blessed, was practised by the * fathers, when they would pray for, or blesse their children. Christ used it in "working of miracles, for they that brought the deaf man prayed him to put his hands upon him: all they that had sick of diverse diseases brought them unto him, and he *layed his hands on every one of them and healed them.* Also Christs disciples practised this *laying on of hands & praying*, not onely in † curing the diseased, but also * upon them that were baptised. And Paul "layed his hands up on those *twelve* at Ephesus who were baptised with Iohns Baptisme.

If the Apostles might lay their hands upon them that were already baptised and pray for them, (and this I hope was no popish confirmation) might not our Saviour do this to these Infants if they were baptised, but it must be a needlesse thing to bring them unto him thus to be blessed? And though you say, I cannot from hence conclude Baptisme, yet from hence I do conclude that Christ performed that action to Infants, that his disciples did afterward unto such as were baptised, viz. laying on of hands and prayer: & likewise I can conclude that Christ admitted of Infants to come to him, and that he prayed for them, And " he prayes not for the world. And that also he pronounceth, that † of such is the kingdome of God. And therefore whether Baptisme can be denyed to such let the godly reader judge.

I avouch constantly against you that: *either they were not the children of the Jewes, or they were not the Infants of beleeving Jewes, or if their parents beleeved, yet it followeth not that, those Infants were of the kingdome of God or so to be baptised: for Christ doth not say of these, but of such is the kingdome of God.*

Although you do so constantly avouch againstme, yet it is but your stout denial, without any reason or probabilitie to the contrary. That these

Infants which were brought to Christ were of the Iewes, I have shew-
ed my reasons before.

But not believing (say you) I answer, how dare you deny them to be pro-
fessors? (of the hart we are no judge) stood they not members of the visi-
ble church? and are they not so long to be accounted for beleevers? nay,
they came to hear Christ, and by presenting their children unto him, and
desiring him to pray, testified their fayth in him, and †charitie binds us to †1 Cor. 13
them of such in the better part.

If their parents believed, yet it followeth not that. therefore these Infants were of the
kingdome of God, or to be baptised &c.

It doth follow that these infants were of the kingdome of God, in that
Christ prayed for them Mar. 10. 16. conferred with Mar. 19. 13. but he
prayed not for them that are not of his kingdome.

*Job. 17

Yea, Christ sayth not of these, (say you) but of such.

And do you not think in your conscience that Christ in these words (of
such) included those infants? would he include others like to them & ex-
clude them? As concerning that place of Mat. 18. 3. 6. which you alledge to
crosse my interpretation of these words, it gaynes you nothing: for the dis-
ciples coming to Christ and asking who is the greatest in the kingdome of
heaven, he teaching them humbleness, called a little child (not a man of
years) and set him in the midst of them saying, except ye be converted & be-
come as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdome of heaven, using the same
word in this place for little children, Mat. 18. 3. that is in Mark. 10. 15.
in Mar. 18. 6. for (little ones) is used another word, that wil as wel agree to
men of yeares, so they be humble, as to children. And in verse the third
Christ doth not deny children to be of the kingdome of God, but teach-
eth his disciples by a simile to be humble mynded as little children, or els
they could not enter into the kingdome of God, † who regards the low-
ly and giveth grace to such. And this doth rather confirm my exposition,
in teaching none can enter into the kingdome, but such as shall be like to
infants.

† Esa. 66.
am. 4. 6.
10. 1 Pet.
5. 5.

Besides, how can you prove that by the kingdome of God Christ understandeth
the visible Church of the new Testament?

First for answer to this question, I wil send you to Mr Smyth in
his * Paralels, Censures and Observations, pag. 122. who sayth, * printed
A. 1609.
That the true visible Church is CHRIST'S shepfold, his kingdome, &c.

Also pag. 15. of the same book, *The true Church in the scripture is called the house of God, the Temple of God the househould of faith and the kingdome of heauen, of Christ and of God.* And in 17. pag. of the same book these are your words they that are not of a constituted Church are no subiects of Christs kingdome, and pag. 16. you say, *that the visible Church is the onely kingdome of Christ,* & that therefore they who are not members of Christs true visible Church are no subiects of Christs kingdome, the like is affirmed in pag. 18. 19. considering therefore what you have written, I marvel you demaund this question, for by your owne words you insinuate that the kingdome of Christ or of God, is the onely visible Church, in that you say, *they are not of Christs kingdome that are not members of a true constituted Church,* and then must it needs follow that by kingdome of God in this place, is understood the visible Church of the new Testament, seing you say, *it is the onely kingdome of Christ.* but I do not consent unto you herein, for there be many of the kingdome of God, that are no members of a true constituted visible Church, as Gods people in Babylon, and those seven thousand in Israel that never bowed their knee to Baall. The kingdome of God extends more largely, (though invisibly) then to the visible Church.

2. To your question, I answer, that the visible Church of the new Testament is the kingdome of God: and so to understand it in this place of Mark 10. 14. 15. is nothing repugnant to the circumstance and scope thereof, although the kingdome of glorie is also intended, both which are but one, yet diversly considered. And he that hath right to the one part hath right also to the other: and therefore Christ saying, *of such is the kingdome of God* he meaneth his whol kingdome of grace and glorie.

Or how can you prove that *Christ blessed none but members of the visible Church?* First, I never did affirme that Christ blesseth none but the members of the visible Church, and therefore you have no reason to require the proof thereof at my hands: 2. If your question be of Gods general blessings, then I answer, that the Lord causeth *"his sunne to shine upon the iust and uniuert, and the rayne to fall upon the good and evil;* all nations and people are partakers of many temporall blessings: but if you speak of spirituall blessings and of those that are purchased by Christs death then I say, *"such blessings apperteyne to the Church, and to the true members thereof whether visible or invisible, because "Christ is given onely to his Church,*

Whom all the promises of God are yea and in him, *Answer*

*1 Cor.
2 Cor. 1.
21. 22.

Or how can you prove that the blessing of Abraham, apperteyneth only to members of the visible Church, &c.

And I ask you, why you put me to the proof of it, seeing I never held any such thing. Nay, I deny that the blessing of God reacheth no further then to the members of the visible Church, for the Churches [†] members are many invisible, but that the blessing of Abraham pertaineth to the visible Church, I hope you will not deny, see Ephe. 2. 11-22. & 3. 6. 19. & 4. 8. — 14. 2 Cor. 4. 9. Col. 1. 3-6. 1 The. 1. 2. — 10. in all which places & in divers others, it doth appeare that these visible Churches have received the blessing of Abraham.

† 1 King
18. Rev.
4.

Or that from this particular of Christs praying for infants, Mar. 10. 13. baptizing of infants to follow.

My argument from this place of Mat. 10. 13. 14. to prove that baptism belongs to the infants of beleevers, you have already, and have not answered it, why require you it againe. I have proved that infants are of the Kingdome of God, as also that the holy things of God, as baptizing, &c. belong to all the members of this kingdome: But further to satisfie your desire, thus I prove baptism to belong to infants, from this particular of Christs praying for them:

For whom Christ prayed, they were of his everlasting covenant, for he prayed for them [¶] which were given him, and not for the world.

† 1 John
10. 28.

But Christ prayed for these infants, Mar. 10. 13.

Therefore these infants were of his everlasting covenant, and so consequently baptism the signe thereof belonged vnto them, seeing God both in making this covenant with Abraham, gave to him and to his seed together with it circumcision the scale thereof. And also in commanding the publishing of the same covenant to all nations did withall command baptism to be administred.

† Gen. 17.
7. — 10.
† Mat.
19.

Again, those whom Christ blesteth, he blesteth with the blessing of Abraham, Gal. 3. 14. conserd with vers. 8. 16. 9.

But Christ blesteth these infants: Mar. 10. 13. as also beleevers.

Therefore Christ blesteth them with the blessing of Abraham, and so consequently these infants were capable of baptism, because the Lord hath

ioyned together the blessing or covenant, and the signe or seale thereof, as before hath bene shewed.

Or how can you prove that Christ obtained for the, & prayed for remission of sinnes, the holy Ghost, sayth, everlasting life, for many were brought to Christ for release of bodily infirmities.

And I demaunde of you againe, for what other things should Christ pray for these Infants, but for spirituall graces; there is no mention that they were brought for the curing of any bodily infirmities in them, and if they had been diseased it is like the Apostles would not have hindered their comming to Christ, & the end of their bringing of their infants to him was to put his hands vpon them and to pray. The reason that Christ yeeldeth why they should suffer little children to come to him, (*because of such is the kingdome of God*) doth argue of what nature the things were he prayed for. Again, where Christ prayed for the curing of any corporall disease, it is recorded with what infirmities they that he prayed for, were troubled; that so the miracle might be knowen, which was the end of his doing of great works. The Centurion requiring Christ for his servant, shewed his disease; but those that brought the infants, mention no corporall infirmity, for which they should desire him to pray for them.

Thus you having made all these questions, you proceed to a second answer saying,

I deny that, it followeth because Christ blessed some of the infants of the Jewes or Gentiles vpon speciall intreatie, therefore that it may hence be concluded, that generally the covenant and the seale of the covenant (as you call baptisme) doth apperteyne to them, for there is not the same reason of all infants as of some specially blessed, as John Baptist, Jeremy, Sampson.

I marvel greatly, that you will thus shift off: doth not my reason prove, that the covenant and seale thereof apperteyneth to the infants of the faithfull, seeing of such is the kingdome of God? Doth Christ say these infants are blessed onely, because they alone are of the kingdom of God? Nay, sayth he not of such (including other infants also) is the kingdome of God? And dooth not the reason which our Saviour useth here, why these infants should come to him inferre so much? for they that brought them, being stayed, he reasons thus against his disciples why they ought not to hinder

concerning the baptising of infants.

53

under them, because of such (as these are,) is the Kingdome of God; meaning not infants, but the infants of beleevers as these were.

But in that you say, there is not the same reason of all infants, as of some specially blessed, &c.

Neyther doo we reason for such speciall blessings or callings, as were given to John Baptist, Jeremy or Sampson, but for the right of the covenant appertayne to all the seed of the faithfull: for although God do out of the seede of beleevers chose some whome he wil imploy to speciall service and use others, and therefore doth bestowe on them more then ordinary graces, yet this hinders not the rest of the infants of the saythfull from their right to Gods covenant or comon salvation.

Neyther indeed can you prove, that these infants which were blessed of Christ, were blessed with any extraordinary blessings or callings, for no such things is recorded of them, therefore to compare them & their blessings with these three extraordinarie servants of God, John Baptist Jeremy or Sampson, is not to make an equall comparison.

Thirdly, If Baptisme doth appertaine to infants because Christ blisseth some particular infants, and because Christ saith the Kingdome of God appertaines to such, then the Lords supper also.

Answer, that doth not follow; the ordinances of Christ belong to the members of the Church and they are to partake of them as they are capa-

The infantnes of the Jewes could receive circumcision at eight dayes of age, but could not eat the pascovers: so likewise the children of Christians are capable of Baptisme the first day of their birth, but not of the Lords supper because the Lord Iesus, of such as participates thereof, requires to examine themselves, to shew forth the Lords death &c. which children cannot performe in regard of their yeares. And therefore it wil not follow that if infants are to be baptised, therefore to receive the Lords supper. And though you would prevent this answer, by saying. They must have it (meaning the Lords supper) as soon as they can eat it; I grant as much, as soon as they can eat it, as the Lord hath* commanded,

† 1. Cor. 11. 26-31.

* 1. Cor. 11. 27.

They

20 They cannot confesse their finnes and faith, and so cannot be baptised.

To this objection sufficient answer is given already, and further explanation of answer will follow.

4. I Would know, why the Apostles put infants back, and why Christ did not command them to be baptised, &c.

Why would you know that which is not written? that the Apostles did not well in putting them back, Christ his rebuking of them, doth manifest: What may be coniectured hath bene noted before. And as for Christ his not commanding them to be baptised, I answer, Christ performed that which they required of him, the text doth not mention that they came to desire baptisme, and therefore there was no cause that he should command them to be baptised.

Next you labour to weaken such proves as I brought from the scriptures to confirme my Argument withall, saying .

You see by that, which hath bene answered, that, both your maior and minor are weak, and the scriptures alledged by you do not confirme them, for the place, 1 Cor. 3. 21. 22. declareth that, all things are yours, that is theirs that actually believe and are baptized, &c.

My major and minor are so weak, that you can disprove neyther of the.

Cor. 3. 21 As touching your answer to this scripture, 1 Cor. 3. 21. 22. you apply
only to them that actually beleeve, which the text sayth not, the Apostles
meaning in this place is, that all such helpes as the Lord Iesus hath appoin-
ted for the benefit of his people are theirs, whether they be men of years,
or infants for he speakes to the whol Church inclusively whereof the chil-
dren are members, (as hath bene proved). But you say, I must prove
that infants have the use of all. I have answered that they are to have the
use of so many of Gods ordinances, as they in regard of their yeares and
knowledge are able to partake of. But not satisfied herewith, you demand
further saying,

Do you think that the members of the Churches are not capable of all the means of salvation? &c.

Ep. 3.23 I answer, that all the members of the Church are capable and partakers of all the means of their *salvation, which is Iesus Christ, yea children, † els can they not be saved. But as concerning the outward ordinances of the Church, as the ministerie of the word, Sacraments and such like, though they be necessarie in their due place, yet the use of them is not

Infants and of all persons required; the Israelites borne in the wilderness were not circumcised by the space of fortye yeares, neyther was the Passover commanded to infants, to offer sacrifice or the like, (though these were necessarily required of them that were growne to yeares;) so that tyme and age doth priueledge some from the practise of those things which otherwise they are bound to observe;

The next Scripture is, Rom. 9. 4. wherein you except against the word (*appertayneth*) and say. *It is put into the text and perverteth the meaning of the Apostle.* For your excepting against the word, (*appertayneth*) saying, *it is put into the text*, you seeme to contend, before you be provoked, I cnelly quoted that place of Rom. 9. 4. and did not set downe the wordes. And therefore to strive about a word added in the translation, is to strive against your owne shadow. I defend no words added, whereby the text is misconstrued. although no verbe be expressed in the original, yet gramatical construction requires some verbe to be vnderstood, as this verbe (*is*.) or *appertayneth*, or some such like, and if (*is*) be vnderstood, it is the same, in sense with (*appertayneth*).

But you say, *Paul intendeth not to prove that the carnall Israelites were actually under the covenant of grace &c.*

Paul intends to set downe the dignitie and prerogative of the people which he had chosen to him selfe to be his inheritance, and to shew that Gods word is true, although Israel be cast of, he performeth his promise to so many of them as he had chosen in his secrete counsel. And this is all that the Apostle intendeth. To your carnal covenant, and to the offer of the spiritual, I have answered before.

Lastly, whereas I did affirme that infants under the Gospel were as capable of baptisme, as children under the lawe, you answer. *That baptisme is not the sign of the covenant of the new Testament, as Circumcision was the seale of the old Testament, and that infants of the old Testament were capable absolutely, seeing that to be circumcised, there was nothing required, but a foreskin apt to be cut off: but to baptisme in the new Testament, there is required actual feyth, repentance confessed by the mouth* Mat. 23. 41. Alb. 8. 37. and 10. 47.

That Baptisme is the seale of the new Testament is proved before, & also that circumcision was a seale of the same spiritual covenant to the Israelites, and that our infants are as capable of baptisme, as the Jewes were of circumcision, your reasons alledged to the contrary are of no force for the

H

difference

† 2. Tim. 1. 12.
† 2. Tim. 1. 12.
† 2. Tim. 1. 12.
† 2. Tim. 1. 12.
† 2. Tim. 1. 12.
† 2. Tim. 1. 12.

Rom. 9.

† 2. Tim. 1. 12.
* pag. 12.

difference you put between the two sacraments of circumcision and baptism, is but a flourish, for as the profession of a true faith, and repentance is required of all them that are of yeares to baptism, so it was of the proselytes, to circumcision.

And if you would compare Infants with Infants, and men of yeares with such like, then shall you see, that there is no more required of our infantes that are to be baptized, then of the children of the Jewes and proselytes; nor lesse looked for of men of yeares vnder the old Testament, then now vnder the new. As for the scriptures that you alledge, they witness what is required of the elder sort to be received into the visible Church, and not of infants. Out of this your answer you collect 5 arguments against Pedobaptistry, the first is this.

They that are not members of the visible Church, have no title to the holy things of God, and therefore are incapable of them: and so of baptism.

Infantes of the faithfull are not actually members of the visible Church: for these places Marc. 10. 13. 14. Mat. 19. 13. 14. do not prove that the parents of these infants were beleeving Jewes, or if they were beleevers their infants were already baptized with their parents according to your doctrine, and so Christ cannot intend baptism to appertaine to them, but the rest of the ordinances. Ergo &c.

I deny the minor, the reason proves it not, & do affirm, that the infants of the faithfull are members of the same Church with their parents, & have right to the holy things thereof; as may thus be shewed: first Abrahams house was a visible Church of God, the infantes of Abraham and of his servants are sayd to "be born in his house: wherevpon I conclude that they were part of Abrahams family: for in that very place the holy Ghost distinguisheth between such as were borne in the house and bought with money, as between them that were by their birth of the family; & of those that being bought, were received into his house.

Secondly; the children of belevers be either members of the Church and within the covenant, or els without, if without, then are they aliens from the common wealth of Israel, strangers from the covenants of promise, without Christ, without hope, and without God in this world: for this the Apostle sets downe to be the state of them that are without: but this Christ did not esteeme of infantes, (who sayd "suffer little children to come to me, for of such is the kingdom of God, nor Paul, that sayd, but now are they holy, speaking of the children of belevers. Concerning the parents of these children that were brought to Christ, which you say, cannot be proved belevers by these places Marc. 10. 13. 14.

Mat. 19. 13. 14.

concerning the baptizing of infants

Mat. 19. 13. 14. I have shewed before what I thought of them. But if they be baptised, say you, Christ cannot intend baptisme vnto them.

Who labours to prove that Christ in blessing them did intend Baptisme vnto them. This I sayd that such as are of the Kingdome of God, and capable of the blessing of Christ are not to be denyed baptisme. And that Infantes are such, I have proved from these scriptures. Marc. 10. 13. 14. Mat. 19. 13. 14. And therefore baptisme not to be denyed them.

2. If the Apostles by putting back infants presented to Christ declare plainly that Infantes were not to be brought to be baptised by Christ the Infantes were not to be baptised by Christ nor comanded to be baptised by him. But the first is true, Ergo &c.

The assumption is denyed, for if the children were not brought to be baptised, how can the Apostles putting them back signifie that Infantes are not to be baptizd? the bringers of them did expresse their mind wherefore they brought them. Agayne if the Apostles by putting the Infantes back did erre, and by Christ are thereof rebuked, what can you conclude from their example, but this, not to judge them vnworthy of Christ and his ordinances, whome he approveth & receiveth. The Scripture speakes not one word, that they did put them back, as judging them vnfit for baptisme.

3. If the persons presenting Infantes to be blessed and prayed for, do not desire baptisme for them, then they knew no such custome used by Christ to baptise them. But the first is true, Ergo &c.

Whether they knew any such custome or not, it is not to the purpose. Christ did as occasion was offered, he satisfied them according to their desire.

4. If Christ receiving Infantes, praying for them, blessing them, doth neither baptise them, nor comand his disciples to baptise them, then either Christs pleasure was they should not be baptised, or els he forgot his durie, in not teaching baptisme of Infantes upon so iust an occasion. But Christ did neither baptise them, nor command his disciples to baptise them, neither did he forget his durie, &c. Ergo.

I answer, the consequent followes not. Christ his pleasure was not against that general comendement given first to Abraham for the setting of the seale vnto his covenant, to all the faithfull and their seed. Also, Christ performed as much as they intreated for at his hands, and though he taught not all things at one time, yet was it no forgetting of his durie, when in due time he taught all things.

H 2

They

3. They that are not actually possessed of the promises or covenant, are not actually by to be invested with baptism. Infants are not actually possessed in the covenant seeing they perform not the condition, viz. confession of their sinnes and their faith actually, Ergo, &c.

17. 9.

18. A3.

19. 1 Cor.

14.

If you mean (by actually possessed) such a state, right or possession, as the Lord of his free grace hath incoffred his people withall, by vertue of the graunt of his covenant to Abraham, I deny the minor, and say, that infants of beleevers are children of the covenant and of the kingdome and actually possessed thereof. As concerning the reason annexed to the minor it is answered before, that the Lord requires the actuall use of faith and repentance of them that are of yeares, and not of infants. And thus much for confirmation of my third reason.

Argument IIII.

1 Cor. 7. 14. If the children of beleeving parents be holy, then are they within the covenant of Abraham, and so consequently have right to the seale thereof.

But the first is true, 1 Cor. 7. 14.

Ergo, the second.

Touching the former proposition. I take it, that none will affirme holynes in any that are not of the covenant, for in that respect Israel was called an holy nation. Exod. 19. 6. 1 Pet. 2. 9. and all others vnclane, A3. 11. 3. and 10. 15. that were without.

If infants be within the covenant, then cannot the seale be denyed to such, seeing the Lord hath joyned the promise and seale together, Gen. 17. 10. which no man may or ought to separate, Mat. 19. 6.

What can be objected against the assumption, I see not, seeing the Apostle playnly affirms, *but now are your children holy*. Vnlesse it may be sayd, as of some I have heard, that as the vnbeleeving wife is sanctified to the husband, so are the children viz: to the use of their Father: but this to affirme is a great abusing of the scripture. For the Apostle in that place answering an objection

Objection that the faithfull is defiled by the societie of the unfaithful: proveth that the faithful husband may with good conscience use the vessel of his unfaithful wife, by an Argument from the effects, namely, because their children, which are borne of them, are accounted holy, or within the promise, God having sayd to all the faithful, I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed. As for that other strange exposition, that the Children of an unbelieving father are no otherwise sanctified than the unbelieving wife is unto her husband, viz: to their fathers use onely, that cannot stand with the meaning & purpose of the Apostle.

For so much may be sayd of an unbelieving servant, that he is for the use of his master to do him service: if children be no more holy then so, then have they no prerogative in being the children of a believing Father, neither is the objectiō removed by this answer.

If it be further pressed that the unbelieving wife is sayd to be holy, as well as the children, yet is she not within the covenant. I answer that she indeed is not holy, as be her children, for she being an infidel is without Gods covenant, and therefore she is sayd to be sanctified to her husband, the Apostle respecting their marriage, which though it was contracted before eyther party beleeved, yet stands firme and not dissolved when cyther of them is called to the faith, so that the believing husband may lawfully use her as his wife, if she be content to dwell with him; 1 Cor. 7. 12. Now the children cannot be sanctified or separated to such use to their father, as the wife is to her husband. And therefore are the children called holy, because they are the seed of a believing father.

Mr. Smyth.

I answer, first denying your major consequent: Since that all the nation of the Jews were holy, and yet not within the covenant of Abraham. I answer as you do of the

H 3

everlasting covenant in respect of Christ: that they were not all within that covenant is plaine, Rom. 9. 8. all they are not Israel which are of Israel: verse. 7. are they all children because they are the seed of Abraham, ver. 12. God revealed that the elder should serve the younger, Act. 7. 51. yee have alwayes resisted the holy Ghost, as your forefathers have done so do you: &c.

Rich: Clifton,

This is a strange opinion of yours, that a people of God can be holy, & be without the covenant in Christ. Is there a people called out and separated from the world to offer sacrifices and to worship God, which may be called and are a holy people considered out of Christ? The covenant made with Abraham, and his seed in Christ to come (which Abraham received) caused that the Israelites were called* a holy natio or a holy people, collectively, being separate from the nations to be the house & kingdom of God. And althought many of the Jewes by vnbelleefe cut of themselves from the priveledges of Abraham: yet considering the rest of that people as his seed, and the generall face of that Church in the true constitution thereof, they were holy as the Apostle sayth, "if the root be holy so are the branches, and if the first frutes be holy, so is the whole lump." As it is one thing to consider of a Church in respect of the whole, as it is one body of Christ, and another thing, to consider thereof, according to every particular member: so is it one thing to call a people, *holy*, respecting their covenant in Christ into which they have solemnly entred. Deu. 29. 10-15. and promised to be Gods people: and another, to consider thereof according to the personal holynes of every particuler member: the Church hath the denominatio of holines, of the former, & not of the latter, (though this also be required) for the personall holines of any particular members, causeth not the whol multitude to be called a holy people, (els might many assemblies be called holy, for that there may be and are some particular persons in the same indued with personall holynes) but their joynt entering into Gods covenant and fellowship in the same: & therefore let diuers holy persons come together to serve the Lord entermingled with an Antichristian assembly, that congregation, shall not be called holy, because there is not a separation of the cleane from the vncleane, and a joyning together of the godly in one body or "fellowship of the Gospel, neyther can you ever prove

Exod. 19.

Rom. 11.

Ab. 4. 2.

Rom. 11.

Philip. 1.

2 Cor. 6.

17.

concerning the baptizing of infants.

wee that any people or congregation is called *holy*, with whom the Lord hath not made his covenant of salvation. But let vs see how you reason.

All the nation of the Iewes (say you) were holy, yet not within the covenant of Abraham &c,

You reason not *ad idem*, for in saying that all the nation of the Iewes were called *holy*, here you speak of them, as they were a people separated from other nations, and had * entered covenant with God to be his people, as he willed them to be their God, in which respect they were called, *holy*, but in saying, *that all were not within the covenant*, you intend it of some particular members of the body of that people, being considered a part from the whole, and so the Scriptures by you alledged do import.

For neyther Paul to the Romanes. cha. 9. 6. nor Steven in the Act. cha. 13. do speake of the whole nation, but of particular persons who by their unbeliciffe and evil workes, did manyfest themselves to be no true Israelites.

Concerning that place of rom. 9. 6. the Apostlle speaking of the rejection of the Iewes (which might there vpon charge God that if he did reject them he kept not promise with their fathers,) labours to remove all such Columnies, saying, *it cannot be that the word of God should take none effect to prove withal, that the promise is not cut of, though the Iewes for their unbeliciffe be rejected, seing the promise is sure to the elect.* The Apostlle thus speaking, not of the body of the people, but of some particulars that he away, is fully alledged, to prove, *that all the nation of the Iewes were not within the covenant of salvation.* And that some of them that were of Israel, were not true Israelites; who wil deny, but that many of them discovered themselves to be no true sonnes of Abraham? yet this proves not that the whole Church in respect of the visible face of it, was not within the covenant.

But you will reply, that you sayd, that they were not all within the covenant, and I answer agayn, if you reason not concerning the face of that people of Israel, but of Gods secret election, and reprobation, it is not to the purpose, for so disputing, you answer not the Argument. And so may you reason against the visible Church under the Gospel, that not all there, are within the covenant, because * many prove hypocrites: And so by your reasoning neither the Church of the new Testament nor of the old, in respect of the generall face thereof, are under the covenant of grace which is the thing controverted, and not the state of particular persons.

As

* Deut.

10. 1

Rom. 9.

* Luk.

21. 26.

1. Job. 2. 1

Of the fourth argument

As touching that place of Act. 7. 51. Steven spake to the Iewes then present to accuse him, but in so speaking did not accuse the whole body of the church vnder the old Testament, but those his persecuters, and therefore fathers who also persecuted the Prophets before them, brake Gods covenant and * so manifested themselves to be of their father the Diu-

Feb. 8. 44.

Now to reason thus, from the example of those wicked Iewes, and to say, many of the Iewes brake the covenant and became rebellious (for al did not) therefore the body of the people was never within the covenant, is to conclude upon a false ground.

If it be objected that the place of the Romanes is spoken in respect of Gods secret election and not of mans knowledge, I answer the twelfth verse is plain of that which was reueled vnto the church, and yet Esau was holy and circumcised, being not vnder the covenant of Abraham in respect of Christ.

The place I have expounded before, and have shewed that the Apostles handles there no such thing as you do gather.

As for the reueiling of this diuision of the sonns of Isaac which you say was to the church; indeed thus much was reueiled to Rebecca, Gen. 27. 23. it was told her that two nations are in thy wombe and two manner of people shoulde be diuided out of thy bowels, and the one people should be mightier than the other, & the Elder shall serue the younger, meaning that they that should descend of the Elder brother, should serue them that came of the younger. For the blessing of Isaac to his two sonns. Gen. 27. 27. 28. 29. 39. 40: Abdi. 20. but that the personal reprobation of Esau was reuealed then to Rebecca or to the church, doth not appear in these words before rehearsed: can any say that none of Esau his posterity was in Gods secret election? & if this scripture will not warrant any so to iudge, then neyther would it warrant Rebecca so to apply it to her sonne being so generally spoken.

The personal rejection eyther of Ismael or Esau was not reueiled, vntil by their euil workes they manifested themselues, and therefore these children being borne in the church, as Esau was in Iacobs house, were to be reputed holy, to be circumcised and held of the covenant, vntil there wickednes threw them out.

That the whole church of the Iewes was not vnder the possession of the everlasting covenant in respect of Christ, but onely vnder the offer of it, I use these reasons, first the condition or obedience of the matter or members of the new Testament is not the synonim or obedience of the matter or members of the old Testament.

People and
reputations

concerning the baptizing of infants.

61

is the condition and obedience of the master and members of the new Testa-
ment. *Mar. 1. 15.* *Ergo faith and repentance is not the condition or obedience of*

master or members of the old Testament.

Your proposition is not true, you exclude faith and repentance from
the members of the old Testament as if by their covenant they were not
bound to beleev and obey his commandments, which is contrary to these
scriptures. *Gen. 17. 1. 6.* *Rom. 4. 3. 13.* *Heb. 11. 17.* *Iam. 1. 21. 23.* *Deu.*
10. 16. 20. & 10. 12. 13. 20. That repentance was required of the Jewes, not
only the prophets often exhorting of them to repentance, do witness, as be-
fore is observed: but also in that their repentance turned away Gods anger
from them: and the conditional promises of pardon if they did repent:
And Gods threatning of judgements against them if they repented not.

And that faith was also required of them, see at these scriptures. *Psal.*
119. 6. 7. 22. 2 Chro. 20. 20. *Esa 53. 1.* and *7. 9.* *Hab. 2. 4.* *Act. 26. 6. 7.*
11. 13. *1 Cor. 10. 3. 4.*

And thus you see that that condition and obedience of the members of
the new Testament, which you say, is *faith and repentance*, was also the con-
dition and obedience of the members of the old Test.

The reason of the major is evident &c. seeing that as the ministerie, worship &
government of the Church of the old Testament was of another nature, then the mini-
sterie, worship and government of the new Testament is: so the condition, viz. the ma-
ster and forme of the Church of the old Testament was of another nature, then the con-
dition, viz. the master and forme of the new Testament, &c. *Heb. 7. 18.* *Gal. 3. 3.*

I answer first, that it is not simply true, that the ministerie & worship of
the church of the old Test. is of another nature from that of the Gospel:
for although in their worship and ministerie were many things typical
& ceremonial: yet wthal God required of them spiritual worship & obe-
dience, without which their ceremonial was abominable. Also, if preach-
ing of the word and prayer &c. be of a spiritual nature, then was their mi-
nisterie and worship more then carnal. The prophet scouldnes of neg-
lect of teaching in the Priests, which argueth that they were bound by their
calling to instruct the people. *Malachy sayth* *The Priests lips shall preserve*
knowledge &c. they shall seek the law at his mouth, for he is the messenger of the
Lord of hosts: and this was by office, for the Lord sayth, *My covenant will*
I make with Levi of life and peace &c. the law of truth was in his mouth. And in *Jeremy*
the Lord complaynes of the Priests, saying, *they that should minister the law*
unto me not: promising unto the people if they repent: that he would give
them

And 1. 15.
15. 7. 15.
Exr. ca. 1.
Neh. 1. 1.
Deut. 10. 16.
10. 17.
**Esa. 1. 16.*
17. 3. 12.
Hof. 6. 1.
3. 1.
Isa. 2. 1.

Esa. 1. 16.
12. 13.
Mal. 1. 1.
4. 1.
Jer. 1. 1.
2. 1.

them "Pastors according to his owne hart, which should feed them with knowledge and understanding." And in Nehemiah it is written, that the Priests and Levites read in the book of the law and gave the sense, and caused the people to understand the reading, and this by their office. Lev. 10. 11. The Jewes had the * lectures of the law and Prophets in their Synagogues. And "Moses had them of old tyme in every citie that did preach him.

Thus we see that the opening of the law and preaching of the scriptures was a part of the ministration of the Priests and Levites, and of their publick worship on the sabbath. Also the Priests gave thanks unto God for the people, blessed them and prayed. The Temple was called *the house of prayer*, Mark. 11. 17. also they had certaine howres of meeting at the Temple, which were called howres of prayer. Act. 3. 1. And they were commanded spiritual sacrifices, as Ps. 4. 5. & 50. 14. 15. 23. as formerly is observed.

Concerning the government of the Church of the old Testament: which was by the Priests and Levites, Elders, I know no great difference in nature of that church, and of this under the Gospel.

The former was governed ecclesiastically by the Priests & Elders: Mat. 26. 47. Luk. 22. 66. Act. 23. 14. and 6. 12. and 13. 15. & 18. 8. 2 Chro. 19. 8. And so the churches of the new Testament are to be governed by the ministers and Elders. Act. 20. 28. 1 Tim. 5. 17. 1 Thes. 5. 12. Hebr. 13. 7. The censures ecclesiastical under the old Testament, were admonition & casting out of the Synagogue: Lev. 19. 17. Ezr. 10. 8. Ioh. 9. 22. and 31. 43. and 16. 2. Lev. 22. 3. Num. 9. 13. & 19. 13. Exod. 22. 19. so are these the censures of the churches under the Gospel. Mat. 18. 15. 16. 17. 1 Cor. 5. 3. 4. 5.

Secondly, for the constitution of the Church of the old Testament, which you say, *was of another nature then that of the new.*

I answer, that former church was of an heavenly constitution, a kingdom of Priests and a "holy nation, the people sancts, as well as the members of the church of the new Testament. And this people being separate from al other nations, & called out to be the Lords "peculiar people were united into one body by covenant between the Lord and them: and so became the people, church and kingdom of God, as in renewing of their covenant is manifest. Deut. 29. 9-15. Exod. 14. 8. They were natural branches of that root and olive tree wherinto we of the Gentiles are gra-

concerning the baptizing of infants.

63

grounded by faith on Christ then to some, in whom they believed, Gal. 3. 12. 14. their covenant leading them to Christ for salvation. Gal. 3. 12. 14. 18. 75.

This old church by their constitution admitted of no profane person to be a member thereof, but such as professed holynes, and were for every transgression appointed to offer sacrifices and to confess their sins Lev. 1. 16. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. Num. 14. 40. & to make satisfaction to the man whom they had wronged. Num. 5. 7.

Now let the constitution of the church under the new testament be considered and compared in the matter and forme thereof, with that of the old, and there will be no such difference in substance between them, as you pretend, the matter of them both being holy and living stones: and the same an holy uniting together in the covenant of God, to walk in all his commandments, else could not the Gentiles be made one body, and communicers with the Jewes, Eph. 2. 14. and 3. 6. and partakers of his promises in Christ, if the constitution of the Jewes church had ben carnal and not spiritual.

Therefore faith and repentance was not required to the matter of the old Testament, but only a carnal holynes, viz. the circumcision of the foreskin &c.

I have already proved, that of the Israelites God did require spiritual holynes, Lev. 11. 44. saying, *I am the Lord your God be sanctified therefore and be holy; for I am holy.* Here it is to be minded that they must be holy after Gods example, who neither is carnally holy, or yet delights in carnal holynes without the spiritual. Psal. 50. 7. 23. Elia. 11. 20. & chap. 50.

And here M. Smyth I observe how you contradict not onely the truth, but your self; for here you affirme that the forme of the Church of the old Testament was carnal, the covenant carnal, & holynes carnal: yet in your book of Differences, you say, that the Septuagint Translation was a Greek form, for the covenant of Grace ought not to have been preached unto the Gentiles. So by your own confession, Israel had the covenant of grace, else could they not have profaned it by preaching of it to the Gentiles, what witch hath turned this into a carnal covenant? can not your hearers see how unstable a leader they follow.

We let us consider those Scriptures which you produce for the proving

Differences
pag. 10.

ving of your carnal covenant, the first is Hebr. 9. 10. To which I answer, that the Apostle, by the law of carnal commandments, intendeth not thereby to teach that the constitution of the old church was carnal, but sheweth the diversitie of Christs priesthood from Aarons, understanding by carnal commandment those frail and transitorie things, which the law commanded in the consecration of the Levitical Priests: so called in respect of Christs anoynting, which was "spiritual."

24.1.

61.1.

45.7.

1.3.

Touching Gal. 3. 3. the Apostle reasoning against them that would joine the works of the law with fayth for justification, exhorteth the Galathians chap. 5. 1. &c. to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free &c. testifying to every man, that if he be circumcised, he is bound to keep the whole law. Noting circumcision especially, because the false teachers did urge it by name for justification. And he reasoneth against it, not as it was in it self by the ordinance of God: but according to that opinion that his enemies had of it, which made circumcision a part of their salvation. And he that so esteemes of it as a work to justifie, must also (sayth Paul) keep all the rest of the commandments. For the law requireth of such as seek to be justified by works and legal ordinances, the whole observation thereof, els doth it promise no * life. And because no man can be justified by the works of the law, therefore doth the Apostle reject circumcision being urged to that end. And when the ceremonies be thus used the Apostle speaketh basely of them, and calleth them beggerly rudiments. And now if a papist or any other should contend, that a man is justified by Baptisme, as by a work wrought, we might so speak to them, as the Apostle doth here to the Galathians, that if you receive baptisme to be made righteous thereby, *ex opere operato*, you are bound to keep the whole law: for baptisme being made a work to justifie, is perverted.

Dent. 27.

Gal. 3.

Rom. 9. 20.

1. 16.

Gal. 4. 9.

And that Paul meaneth by *Circumcision*, in this place as a work urged to justification, the very next verſe, viz. ver. 4. sheweth, wherein he sayth, *ye are abolished from Christ whosoever are justified by the law.*

And thus much for answer to your first Arg. the second followeth.

a. The type, shadow, figure, similitude of a thing is not the truth; the substance the thing it self: time is nature and reason. The constitution, and the nature & form of the Church of the old Testament is the type &c. the constitution or the matter and forme of the church of the new Test. is the truth &c. Heb. 10. 1 & 9. 19. 23.

I answer, first, to your Major, that one and the same thing may both be the type

type and the truth, for Isaac was a type of the faithful, as your self doth
 say, yet was he also faithful, and so was both the type and the truth,
 accordingly to your Minor, the constitution; viz. the matter and forme of
 the old church is nor the type &c. of the church of the new Testament, in
 that sense as you take matter and forme: for the matter of that former Ch.
 was not to be ceremonially, but truly holy, as before I have proved, and
 these scriptures quoted in the margent do further confirme. Their co-
 venant was to be the Lords people, & is the same that we are entred into,
 we could not the blessing of Abraham come on the Gentiles through Iesus Christ,
 but we might receive the promise through faith, if that the covenant which we
 receive were not the same that was made to Abraham and his seed. Also
 Peter affirmes it to be the same, Act. 2. 39.

If then the Lord required of Israel true holynes, and made no other co-
 venant with them wherby he would accept them to be his people, but that
 everlasting covenant, and that this is the matter and forme of the church
 of the new Testament, (true holynes of the members, and communion in
 the covenant and Gospel) then was not the constitution of the former Ch.
 shadow of this, but even the same with the church under the new Test.
 I speak of the substance of this covenant, and not of the outward admi-
 nistration thereof, which was divers, & wherein there might be some type
 or shadow in the former of this latter.

Concerning the scriptures which you quote for the proof of your As-
 sumption, In the former, Heb. 10. 1. the Apostle sheweth that the sacri-
 fices under the law were imperfect, because they were yearly renewed; & pro-
 veth also that Christs sacrifice is one and perpetual; & here it must be mind-
 ed, that he speaketh of the administration of the old Testament differing
 from the new; & not to teach that the church of the Jewes had in regard
 of their constitution no spiritual promise, but onely carnal & typical things.
 In that other scripture, Heb. 9. 19. 23. Paul sets down the proportion be-
 tween the type and the thing typed; between the legal sacrifices and pur-
 gings, & the purging of synne by the blood of Iesus Christ, between the
 old Testament and the new &c. and so shewing how the truth answereth
 unto the type, concludeth that Christ hath taken away the finnes of many,
 by the sacrifice of himself. And this is that which the Apostle intendeth,
 and not to shew that the constitution of the old church was the type of the
 constitution of the new.

† Den. 2.
 9. & 10.
 8. & 9.
 15. & 20.
 1. & 2.
 37. & 38.
 14. Den.
 12. 16.
 * Den.
 10. & 11.
 * Gal. 3.

Heb. 10.

Heb. 9.
 23.

3. *Th. it. Which was not nor could not be accomplished performance of all duties produced by the walking or communion of the church of the old Testament, was not required or exacted or presupposed to the constitution of the church of the old Testament. Justification and faith, and sanctification and repentance, were not effected, performed accomplished or produced by the walking or communion of the church of the old Testament. Heb. 9. 9. Gal. 2. 15. 16. Ergo &c.*

The assumption is denied and the contrary is proved before: for the members of that church might have and had faith, repentance, justification & sanctification, seeing the Lord was their God in that standing, & he is God to none but to them that are his in Christ: & therefore it must follow, that they were partakers of faith, justification, &c. in that their communion. Again, as the covenant was given to Abraham, so was "it to his seed: but to Abraham it was given for justification, therefore to his seed: I mean the Israelites and people of God that were before and under the old Test. Also, I have proved* before, that God required of the Israelites, "faith and repentance, and that they did repent & believe, & so consequently justification & sanctification were effected & accomplished in the members of that church in the communion thereof, and required in the constitution: Touching Heb. 9. 9. you may be satisfied in my answer to your second Argument, yet this I will further add, that the Apostle having described the partes of the Tabernacle &c. in ver. 9. sheweth the use of those things to be a figure for the present, preaching unto them spiritual things in Christ, in whom they believed the same to be fulfilled.

And here it must be observed that these ordinances whereof the Apostle speaketh, were such as by Moses were given to that church, long after the constitution thereof.

In that other scripture, Gal. 2. 15. 16. Paul reasons not about the constitution of the Ch. of the Jewes whether justification was required therein, but having to deal against the false teachers that taught, the Galathians could not be justified without the works of the law, affirmeth the contrary in these two verses, saying, *We Jewes by nature know that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Ch. &c.* This being the purpose of the Apostle to establish justification by faith without works, doth not deny the church before the coming of Christ to be justified by faith: but teacheth that both that church, and this under the Gospel were saved not by works, but by the free promise of God in Christ received by faith. And

you see neyther of these scriptures proves your desire.

That which brought not perfection and life to the members, presupposed inward repentance to the members, and so not real or true holynes: But the old Testament and obedience of the law brought not perfection and life to the members of that church of the old Test. Heb. 7. 19. Gal. 3. 21. Ergo &c.

First concerning the major, The old Testament though it brought not perfection, yet did it require sayth in Christ to come. 1. Touching your minor, first I require what you mean by the old Testament, whether the books thereof or the covenant of works whereof Moses was the Mediator, the former, then is your minor false, for those books conteyn as wel Gospel as law, the promise made up to the fathers in Christ, to the receiving whereof was required at all tymes sayth and repentance, as well before Christs incarnation as since. But if you mind it of the law onely & admission of Moses, it is true, that perfection and life came not by the law, nor by the obedience or ceremonies of the law: but withal you must know that the Jewes were also partakers of the everlasting covenant in Christ, as before is proved.

For the church of the old Testament, it could bring or publish life to the members thereof, seing it had the promises of the Gospel, and so presupposed sayth, repentance & true holynes as you speak.

To the scriptures, first to Heb. 7. 19. I answer, that the law indeed, maketh nothing perfect, nor could give lyfe, but I have told you againe and againe, that the law was not that proper & onely form of the Jewish church, but the covenant in Christ received by Abraham.

Concerning Gal. 3. 21. The Apostle teacheth that: if the law could have given life, righteousness should have bene by the law, & this who denyeth: but with you ought to oblerve that he sayth, the law is not against the promises: & these promises were geven to the old church: as wel as the law was given, & thereby they might have & had life under the old Testament.

That which was a schoolmaster onely to teach Christ did not presuppose that the scholars had already learned Christ or put on Christ, which is onely done by sayth and repentance: The law or old testament was a schoolmaster onely to teach Christ Gal. 3. 24. Rom. 10. 3. 4. Ergo &c.

The law was a schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, and the

The major is not simply true, for a scholler may have learned somethings by his schoolmaster, and yet continue vnder him stil to be further instructed. And so the lawe might lead them to Christ (lawe being taken in that Place for al the ordinances of Moses) and they by fayth put on Christ to come.

But I answer to the minor, That the lawe was a schoolemaster to teach Christ, I say it was, that *they might be made righteous by fayth*: but can a schoolmaster teach Christ without teaching fayth in Christ? & if they were taught fayth, did they not learne fayth? The Apostle Gal. 3. 24. setteth downe the use of the lawe or legal œconomy, 1. That the Iewes thereby might be kept as it were by a garison, shut up unto the fayth which after should be revealed, verse. 23.

Secondly, that they might be instructed of righteousness and salvation by Christ, vers. 24. for during the legal œconomy their hope was nourished by the Prophets, which prophesied of Christs comming.

Also by the ceremonies and sacrifices they were instructed; by circumcision that Christ should be borne of the seed of Abraham, that by his death and spirit should† circumcise their hearts: by the paschal lamb they were taught that Christ as* an innocent lamb, should be slayne to take away their sinns and by the other sacrifices, and sprinkling of blood, and washings; was signified the offering up of Christ to come, & the applycation of his death to the purging of them from al their syns, whereof they were partakers by fayth.

Thirdly, this Argument may thus be returned upon you: That which was a schoolmaster to teach Christ doth presuppose that the schollers should learn Christ, and put him on by fayth and repentance: But the law or old Testament was a schoolmaster to teach Christ. Therefore the law or old Testament did presuppose that the schollers should learne Christ, and put him on by fayth &c.

Touching the other scripture Rom. 10. 3:4. The Apostle there layeth out the blind zeale of the Iewes, that being ignorant of the righteousness of God which is by fayth, sought to establish their owne righteousness which

is of works, and submitted not to the righteousness of God, this he reproves in them: and then vers. 4. setteth downe the reason of their ignorance

of the righteousness of fayth, because they did dispise the end of the law which is Christ, so called, because the* law is fulfilled onely in him.

Thus you may see the Apostle speaks not against the constitution of that

former

former church, but against the corruption of some members of the same.

1. *That which was hidden, & kept secret was a myſterie and not reveyled, the members of the old teſtament in their conſtitution were not indued withal. Fayth or credence to the Goſpel was a myſterie and not reveyled, but kept ſecret from the beginning.* Gal. 3. 23. Rom. 16. 25. Ergo &c

There is a fallacy in your ſetting down of this word *Fayth*, you conclude that which is not in the propoſitions, or els your Argument is not to the purpoſe. For *Fayth*, in the ſecond propoſition according to the meaning of the Apoſtle. Gal. 3. 23. which you cyte for proof thereof, is not put for the gift of fayth, which is given to al true belevers whereby they are juſtified, as in Gal. 2. 16. 20. and 3. 6. 8, 9, 11, 12, 14. but for the things beſeared, or fulfilling of the promiſes of God: for in the tyme of the law was fayth, els the former church could not have been ſaved, ſeeing the prophet ſaith, *† the juſt ſhall live by fayth*, & the Goſpel was preached to them, (with- out * which they could not beleev,) yea to " Abraham. And though the things promiſed were not fulfilled during the tyme of the old Teſtament: yet had the Iewes *† fayth* in Chriſt promiſed, and thereby were ſaved.

If you reply, that the church of the old Teſtament was not indued with fayth in her conſtitution. I anſwer, that there can be no church to God founded without the everlaſting covenant in Chriſt, by " which Abraham & his ſeed became the people of God, and therefore indued with fayth in their conſtitution.

Concerning Rom. 16. 25. By *myſterie*, the Apoſtle meaneth the calling in of the Gentiles which now is opened and publiſhed among al nations. And it ſhall be underſtood of the Goſpel or preaching of Chriſt, as ſome doe, yet as it called a myſterie: partly in reſpect of the nations to whom it was not reveyled before the comming of Chriſt, as ver. 26. Alſo to the Iewes, in reſpect of *†* the things promiſed; but the promiſe of ſalvation was preached to Adam, to Abraham, and to the whole church, and was no myſtery kept ſecret from the beginning of the world, but in al tymes and ages revealed to the Lords people, and by them received

7. *There is no condemnation to them that are in Chriſt: There is condemnation to them that are under the law, for it is the miniſterie of death or condemnation.* 2 Cor. 3. 7. Ergo, the law or old Teſtament doth not preſuppoſe Chriſt, or they that are under the law are not in Chriſt, and ſo the members of the church of the old Teſtament are not truly holy.

Surely this reasoning of yours makes me doubt, that you reason against your own knowledge, for how can you be ignorant that the church of the Iewes was not under the law as it is the ministerie of death, I mean in respect of their constitution? There is indeed condemnation to them that are under the law, that is, which by the works thereof seek justification; and so were some members of the old church under the law, as the Pharisees that sought to justify themselves, as now they are that do the like: but to hold, that the whole church was under condemnation, & without faith in Christ, is an error to be abhorred.

That scripture, 2 Cor. 3. 7. intendeth no such thing: for the Apostle speaking of the ministration of death, compareth the ministerie of the Gospel with the ministerie of the law, shewing that the law was glorious which pronounced death to them that continued not in all things to fulfil it: then much more the ministration of righteousness shall exceed in glorie, which bringeth salvation to them that beleeve. This is the meaning of the Apostle: and not to shew that Israel was under condemnation, seeing they were partakers of the covenant in Christ. And as they, so wee under the Gospel have the law to accuse & condemn us, if we transgresse it, but as we through repentance and sayth in Christ are freed from the curse of the law; so were the Iewes also. Now the law is the ministration of death not to the church, eyther before or since Christ, but to the "faythlesse and disobedient both under the old Testament and under the Gospel.

Finally (you say) the whole disputation of Paul to the Romanes and Galathians concerning justification by sayth in Christ without works of the law doth evidently confirme this excellent truth, teaching that the utmost obedience of the law did not effect justification. Therefore the law or old Testament did not presuppose it.

That excellent truth which you labour to confirme by the disputation of Paul concerning justification, is a notable error. For where Paul reasoneth against such as mainteyned justification by the works of the law, he doth not teach thereby that the old Testament did not presuppose true holynes, for albeit some of the Iewes fell into this error, to hold justification by works of the law, yet did the church look unto Christ for justification then, as wel as now. And though the utmost obedience of the law could not effect justification, yet sayth in Christ could effect it, which I have proved that the old church had, in that they

had the

had the promise of salvation in Christ.

For it had bene vanitie, to have given a law which should not or could not preserve and produce that which was in them in their first constitution:

therefore I do defend against all men that the church of the old Testament in the matter or constitution of it, was not really holy, but onely typically &c.

I have shewed already that the law was given to the old Church to teach them holynes, not to make them holy; and so it did produce or effect that wherefore it was given, and therefore your bould defence against al men, that the constitution of the church of the old Testament was not really holy but typically; hath in it more boldnes then truth: the contrary is proved † before. And therefore your inference is false, viz. that the members thereof admitted in by circumcision were not truly holyer in possession of that everlasting covenant. &c. but onely under the offer of it, that typical testament given to Abraham, and after ward assumed written & confirmed by Moses. Job. 7. 19-23. with Heb. 8. 8. 9.

† pag. 77
&c.

That the everlasting covenant was given to Abraham and his seed, see pag. 20. &c. concerning these scriptures; in the former, Christ charging the Iewes with breach of the law who were angry against him for making a man whole on the sabboth day, proveth his fact lawfull from their owne practise, reasoning thus, if you may circumcise on the Sabbath and not break the law, then why may not I as lawfully heal a man: this is that Ch. intendeth. now because it is sayd ver. 22. that Moses gave them circumcision, &c. it seemes you would gather withal that the ordinances of Moses or old Test. were given, first to Abraham, and after ward assumed & written by Moses, but that cannot be proved by this place: For circumcision was a signe of the promise in Christ, not of the law, as before it proved.

John 7.
19-23.

In that of Hebr. 8. 8. 9. the Apostle sheweth that Christ is the Mediator of a better covenant then were the Levitical Priests, and therefore his ministerie more excellent then theirs: this first hee proveth, because this covenant was established upon better promises, and then he sheweth the excellency of it compared with the former: And that God made it with his people he proves by the Testimony of Ieremy. Now concerning the first Testam. it was made with the church,

Heb. 8.

K 3

when

when the Lord gave his law in Sinai & the people did covenant with him saying, *Altho' the Lord hath commanded we will do*, of Abraham we do not finde that he did promise the keeping of the law under the curse, as Israel did, Deut. 27. 26. and therefore the law, the covenant of works or old Testament, was not first made with him, and after exemplified by Moses, but it was $\dagger$ made with Israel: as further also may be shewed by the description thereof, in Heb. 9. 1-10. which can not be referred to Abrahams tyme.

Agayn, the Apostle* sayth, *when Moses had spoken every precept to the people according to the law, he toke the blood of calves and of goats and sprinkled at the people, saying, this is the blood of the Testament which God hath appointed unto you &c.* Also the confirmation of this Testament was by the ministerie of Moses. And Paul sayth, that the law was 430. yeares after the covenant that was confirmed afore of God to Abraham, & his seed in respect of Christ: Now if the law had been geven to Abraham, the Apostles Argument taken from the distance of tyme had been of no force. And thus much for answer to your Arguments.

Next followes your answer to my objections, wherein stil you asserme, *That the nation of the Jewes was not truly holy, but typically, & that their holynes was this, that by that external covenant whereinso they were by circumcision admitted, they were trained or schooled to Christ, &c.*

What is here sayd, is answered elswhere, & here I deny that the Jewes holines was onely typical, though I deny not that they were by types and ceremonies lead unto true holynes in Christ, whereof also they were partakers by the covenant of grace.

Concerning Exod. 19. 6. alledged to prove that Israel was called a holy people, you answer thus: *I say that, either the meaning is, that they were typically holy trained up to holynes, or that they by atteyning the end of the law should be true holynes in Christ: so that, this place is nothing to your purpose of the holynes of the eternal covenant, which God made with Abrahams.*

It seems you are not fully resolved of the meaning of this scripture. Ex. 19. 6. *ye shall be to me a kingdome of priests & a holy nation.* This being minded of the people or nation they could not be called a kingdome of Priests in respect of a typical priestthood which was proper to Aaron and his sons, but in respect of their spiritual priestthood in Christ as the Apostle sayth, **ye are made a holy priestthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices,* which place doth well expound this of Exodus 19. 6. that the Lord doth intend to cal them holy in regard

rightly applyed: But you must know that there is a general giving and applying of the promise on Gods part to his people, and there is a more special and particuler applying of the same, by the ministerie of the word and spirit: The former was to Abraham when God made his † covenant with him and his seed: The other is to al that receive the word & keep it. whereof Luk. 11. 28. A&C. 2. 21. Iam. 1. 21. This actual possession (to use your phrase) belongs to such as by their yeares are capable to understand, and it is a continual applying of that which was given in general to the faythful and their seed. And of such are those places of Rom. 10. 17. Gal. 3. 2. 14. to be understood. And this the Lord requires according to the dispensation of the covenant, both under the old and new Testament, that al they that are his people capable of understanding should hear his word and yeeld obedience to the fayth. For although God love the children for the fathers sake; & respect his promise, yet wil he have them as they come to yeares, to practise fayth and obedience, unto which end the † preaching of the word is given unto us.

Secondly, I answer concerning the consequent of your maiors consequent, that it shal not follow, that because children are under the covenant, that therefore they shal have the outward signe and seal thereof, for under the law the females were actually under the covenant of the old Testament, yet were not signed with the seal. And before the law was given, al that were actually under the covenant until the tyme of Abraham had no external signe or seal thereof.

It must follow, that if children be under the covenant that they must have the outward signe or seale, because the † Lord hath so commanded, joyning the seal to his covenant which man may not *separate. For your reasons to the contrary, they are of no weight. First concerning the females under the law, though they were not circumcised, yet were they accounted of the circumcised. And for the ceremonie it self they were never capable of it yong nor old, the like you wil not say of children under the Gos. For the fathers before the institution of circumcision, they might be under the covenant & without the seal, because the L. did so dispece with those times; but you must prove that the state of children under the new Test. is alike to the condition of those fathers before Abr. or of the women under the law, & the wil it follow that they shal nor be sealed at al, for these that you instance were not. It is one thing when God hath commaunded the signe and adjoynd it to his covenant to be received: & another when he comma-

no such thing. They are to receive the seal, to whom the covenant with the seal is given; as it was to Abraham and now is unto us. And therefore the signe may not be denyed to whom the covenant belongs. But to bringe this truth you say, *The Lord in choosing the male onely to be circumcised thereby proposed to teach in a type, that onely the male, (that is one that is an heir) should be sealed with the spirit of promise under the new Testament.*

That circumcision so signifieth as you set downe, you are to prove, in that it was sett upon the male, it did type out Christ, that promised through whom our corruption is purged, as before is observed. And if circumcision be such a type, (as you here asserme) how can you exclude children under the new Test? they are Christs and in the covenant,† capable of the spirit or new birth, & therefore to be sealed.

† Rom. 8
Th. 3. 7.

Ifu be objected that, before the law there was no seal appointed, I say, hereby it appeareth that to be under the covenant was not the cause of tytle to the seal: but the express commandement of God. &c.

But to be under the covenant after the seal vvas thereunto annexed is sufficient cause of tytle to the seal, except you vvil disjoyn those things that God hath coupled together:

In the next place you answer to the Assumption of my Argument vvhether you desire of me to expound unto you vvhath is this holynes vvhich the Apostle mentioneth, 1 Cor. 7. 14. If I say under the covenant, then you demand vvhath it is to be under the covenant, and so you proceed from question to question, as if you could not find out a direct answer without such interrogatories.

To your first demand, I answered before & shewed that this holynes in 1 Cor. 7. 14. is in respect of the covenant, that children of the believing fathers are called *holy*, by the Apost. Then what it is to be under the covenant, happily you wil say, so be iustified by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ.

Although thus to answer be true, yet is it not all that we are to answer to this demande. For to be under the covenant is to be considered 2. manner of wayes. 1. according to the L. solemne dispensation of his covenant with his people, & their admittance thereinto, after vvhich manner it vvas made with Abraham and his seed. And thus the covenant vvas established in * them that were unborne at the tyme of the promise making, being then in the loynes of Abraham. Secondly. men are sayd to be under the covenant after a more special and hidden manner. And so all the elect

* Gen. 17.
21. All
39. D.
17.

the elect whether known by the confession of their sayth, or lying hidden in the consold assemblies of the world, are within the cov. of salvation; after this hidden manner we cannot judge who is within, who is without, some we may judge to be within, in respect of their outward standing, which in the Lords sight are without, and some without whom the Lord accepteth: but after that external and solemn making and receiving of the covenant of life, we are to repute † al that makes profession of their sayth, with their seed to be under the covenant, and * branches of the olive tree until they fal away. And of these that are thus under the covenant, there be many "hypocrites which are not partakers of salvation in Christ.

Then I demand which of these three, viz. to be holy, to be under the covenant, to have Christs righteousness imputed, is first in nature: happily you wil say, first they are under the covenant, secondly, iustified, 3. sanctified or holy.

I perceive you would draw us by your supposed answer, from that generall holynes apperteyning to the whole church of God, by reason of the covenant of salvation made with them, to the sincere holynes of perticular persons, which is not found to be in al that are visible members of the ch. For this we say, that a people that are entred covenant with God, are in regard thereof, holy; because they are separate from the world unto God, and so are to be esteemed of us, as they to whome is promised Christ with al his blessings, whereof they are partakers, if by unbelief they hinder not themselves of that holynes of the olive whereinto they were planted, & in this sense are we to understand that place of the Apostle. 1 Cor. 7. 14.

Then I proceed and demand, When do Infants come under the covenant, when they are conceived or when they are born, or when the parents are converted being born already. It wil be answered that Infants begotten of saythful parents come under the covenant in their conception, and such as are borne come under the covenant when their parentes are regenerate. Hereby it appeareth, that the covenant is conveyed to the children by generation & by filial relation.

Thus I answer as formerly I have done, that the covenant belongs to the parents and their seed, through the free grace & gift of God, the Lord binding himself by promise to be God to the saythful and to their children, which though they be borne according to the course of nature & are in the covenant, yet is their so being within it, not by vertue of their carnal berth simply considered; but by vertue of Gods promise. Indeede this we say, to be borne of beleeving parents is a declaration of the children being

concerning the baptizing of infants.

83

being in Gods covenant, & that they come under the covenant when their parents do first believe, whether they be borne already, or to be borne: I mean such parents as were before strangers to the covenant.

Some will say, if it be true that some say, that children under the government of the church are under the covenant, that the covenant is conveyed also, by papish baptism, & so of servants under believing masters &c.

God making his covenant with believers, includeth their families, as in Gen. 17. 7. with verse 9. 13. where the Lord establishing his covenant with Abraham, included his whole household, borne in his house or bought with money; for he commanded al to be circumcised. So Zacheus manifesting his faith and repentance, Christ sayd, *this day is salvation come unto this house*: see also Act. 16. 30, 31, 33. and Jer. 31. 1. And thus do we affirm thereof, according to the scriptures.

You say, *Why may not the infants borne under one king, if his subjects be at his service and assents be by that relation brought under the covenant, and so be accounted in the land and sanctified.*

God hath established his covenant to the believers and their seed, not to a king and his subjects, and therefore this relation wil not stand with the condition of the covenant.

The relation of a King and a subject is as near as the relation of a master and a servant or an adopted child.

The relation of a king and subjects, be it never so near, maketh not the purpose: seeing we are to mynd with whom God maketh his covenant, who tyeth not himself to civil relations, but freely accepteth the believers and his family, and further then this relation, the scripture doth not warrant us to apply Gods covenant.

And then I demand (say you) seeing the relation of a man and wife is stronger than that of adoption or servitude, why the wife shal not be under the covenant for the relation of marriage? happily it wil be sayd, that the wife bring of herself cannot be admitted because of her unbelief, and I say that infants cannot be admitted because of their want of faith.

It is true that neither the wife nor servants if they refuse, can be admitted because of their unbelief, but the case is not alike of men and women grown to years, as of infants borne in the church, the former either consent or refuse actually, infants do not refuse, and therefore being the seed of the faithful are to be admitted to baptism.

L

Fin

But it will be said, that the covenant with Abraham was with him and his seed only, I say, it was made (by your confession) with him, and his adopted son, &c.

We say as the scripture teacheth us, that the everlasting covenant was made with Abraham and his seed, the faithful & their children: Gen. 17. Act. 2. 39. and that the Lord intended thereby, the whole family of the faithful, if they refused not, as before is proved.

And seeing some not of the seed may be admitted into the covenant, and those that are further off, why shall not those that are nearer, as his wife?

I have answered before, her, unless it hinders her, to be one flesh, makes them not one in the covenant, which is by grace not by marriage.

But you will say, because infants do not refuse the covenant, they may be admitted to baptism, &c. but wives refusing, may not. I further insist, that, as infants do not resist, so they do not consent, and that, all the children, servants and wives, that do not resist may be admitted, though they cannot make declaration of their faith, &c. &c.

We do not make the infants not refusing, the cause of their acceptance to the seal of the covenant; but the Lords dispensation and commandments in children there can be neither actual consent or resisting, the one of which is found to be in them that are of years: who also are to live by their own faith: also confession is of such required, so is it not of infants.

Then if say there is no reason why faith and repentance should be required of one to make him capable of the covenant of justification &c. more then of another, except God be an acceptor of persons.

To this I have answered before, and again do answer, that there is one and the same way of entering into Gods covenant for Abraham and for all other believers, they receiving the covenant after the same manner that he did, believing that God is their God and the God of their seed. Also faith and repentance, is required not onely of such as are of years, and to enter into the Lords covenant, but of all that are in the covenant, (they being the condition thereof on our part, to be performed) continually: and therefore we must know, that it is Gods good pleasure that makes men capable of the promise, and not any act of theirs: faith receiveth grace, but causeth it not; and repentance is the fruit thereof, required of every one, as they are of understanding.

And further, the covenant is only with Abraham and his seed, not with others.

concerning the baptizing of infants.

23

children &c. and therefore faith and repentance must necessarily be had, and so they cannot be baptised till they show these signs. &c.

I have proved already, that God in saying, *I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed*; included Abrahams family; or els shew unto me, wherefore they were with him partakers of circumcision, if they were not with him in the covenant. Agayn, faith and repentance is required of the elder sort, not of infants; Ergo &c. As for partaking of the covenant actually, how children are thereof capable, I have proved enough; and therefore it needs no further answer.

And whereas it may be justly objected against you, that if infants be deemed to be within the covenant, they cannot be saved, you labour to remove this exception; saying, *we pronounce nothing of infants dying before they be converted, but leave the secret of them to the Lord*.

Thus you leave a starting hole hereafter to determine as it will prove for or against your opinions: is the condition of infants such a secret that God hath not manifested his wil concerning them? Was not Abraham to take notice of the state of his infants, when he was to circumcise them? Gen. 17. 12.

And doth not Christ his receiving of little children and blessing them, manifest unto us, how we ought to account of the infants of believers?

The prophet Malachi saith, *He did not he make one, seeking a seed*.

Act. 2. 39. the promise is to children, as Peter there witnesseth; and Jer. 31. 1. God promiseth to be the God of all the families of Israel, and children are a part of the familie; 1 Cor. 7. 14. the children of the believers are called holy.

Now if God had given you eyes, these scriptures might teach you that the state of the children of the faithful is no such secret, as you pretend. Moses shewed the state of children under the old T. & sayd, *the new Testament is a better direction of all affairs*. &c. as the old. How is it then that the state of children is now more secret, then formerly it was? Thus you might see your speeches contradictory, if your right eye were not blinded.

Secondly, I desire you to prove unto me by scriptures, that in this place *holiness* signifies true sanctification.

And I desire you to prove unto me, that this or that member of a visible church is truly sanctified; you keep not to the state of the question, that place is so benighted of the general holiness pertaining to the whole every member thereof in respect of the covenant, & your demand is of

that inward holynes which is onely proper to the elect, and known to God who alone is the searcher of the hart, and whereof man cannot judge.

Then framing my Arg. into your own form, as if you had espied weaknes therein, you say: *I aske you Sir, in good sooth is this circular reasoning sound, you say infants are holy because they are under the covenant, and you say they are under the covenant because they are holy.*

Sir if you had pleased to have read my answer without perverting my meaning, you might have seen my reasoning both sound and lawful. Thus I took as granted, that none would be so foolish to affirme holynes to be in any person out of Gods covenant, and it being yielded unto, as it must, (unlesse men can be holy without Christ) it wil follow, that al that are holy are within the covenant: and so econtra holynes and the covenant respecting each other, as the cause and effect. And the reasoning is alike to that of the Apostle, *If the root be holy, so are the branches; and if the first fruits be holy, so is the whole lump.* for proof hereof, these scriptures were quoted: Exo. 19. 6. 1 Pet. 2. 9. Act. 11. 3. & 16. 15.

Tbirdly, I answer, that holy, doth not signifie as you expound it, neither is the Argument taken from the effects, but from the greater to the lesse, after this manner: If your children (in your judgement) be holy, and you do not put them away when you are converted to the faith; but use them still to al those uses whereto children are appointed, the relation natural of father and son remaining, though you believe, then much more the relation of man and wife remaining; and you may use your wives: they being of a more natural band then your children: But the first is true &c. Ergo &c.

As your self is estranged from the faith, so is this your exposition from the meaning of the Apostle, who intended to prove that a faithfull man may use his wife, though she be an unbeliever, setting down this for a reason: because the children that are born of them are holy; now this holynes, (whereof such children are partakers, by the covenant) you apply to civil uses or duties.

That children in this place, or in any other scripture, are called holy for such respects it resteth for you to prove: I denye your exposition to be the Apostles meaning: for if in these respects (as you note) children be holy to their parents, to use them to such civil uses, wherunto children are appointed, then shal the children of infidels be holy, (& so their state as good as the condition of the children of the faithfull, for they serve to such uses.

But if you mark the words of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 7. 14. you shal perceive

Brod. 1916. It before expounded, and it to be understood of the general face of that church, which was called holy; because the Lord had received them by covenant to be his peculier people. in Brod. 319. & 339. the Lord calls them a stiffnecked people, in regard of personal finnes, which he found to be in some of them, not in all, the which did argue a breach of covenant on their part; whereof they repenting, the Lord forgave them. The personal finnes of some members do not dispoſſes the face of the church of holynes, in ſubſtancing to reforme ſuch faulty members. Concerning the holynes of children, & of the unbelieving wife, before is ſhewed.

Finally, you ſay, *God hath ſayd to al the faithfull, I will be thy God, and the God of thy ſeed. I deny it utterly: God ſayd that onely to Abraham, Gen. 17. 7. and therein you expound it literally and ſpiritually. I would be contently to ſee you add ſomewhat more, the meaning of it is this; that God made his covenant with the faithfull man or faithfull woman; and their infants begotten of their bodies: but that literally the meaning is, I will be God unto this Abraham, and thy ſeed according to the fleſh, to give them the land of Canaan, Gen. 17. 8. and ſpiritually the meaning is, I will give unto Abraham the father of the faithfull and of thine, are his ſpiritual ſeed, everlaſting if not*

You deny a ſimilitude truth; as it is your manner to eſtabliſh your liſtes. I have proved already that the ſpiritual covenant is given to the faithfull and their ſeed, as it was to Abraham and his ſeed, and further confirm it thus.

1. That promiſe that was made to Abraham is the ſame that becometh to the faithfull, and therefore as God did apply it to Abraham ſaying, *I will be thy God and the God of thy ſeed*: ſo is it to be applied to every beleever, as Gen. 17. 39. God ſpeaking of Iſaac ſayd of him, as before of Abraham that he would eſtabliſh his covenant with him and with his ſeed.

And A.C. 2. 39. the ſame promiſe was applied to the Iewes that were preſent at Peters preaching; and to their children, and this application he the words following to have, *ſayd to the multitude at the Lord's feet ſayd* (v. 38) *viz. 101*

ſo many; and their ſeed (v. 40) *Secondly if the covenant was not made to the faithfull and their ſeed; then are not the faithfull partakers of the ſame covenant with Abraham; for it was to Abraham and his ſeed, and ſo by your doctrine we have not the ſame covenant and goſpel that was preached to*

Abraham, and conſequently no promiſe of ſalvation. Thirdly, that this promiſe, I will be thy God and the God of thy ſeed, is made to al the faithfull and their ſeed. ſee theſe ſcriptures quoted in the margin: ſpecially the applying of this promiſe to Abraham and his ſeed, doth teach us ſo to apply it to every faithfull man and his ſeed: the Apoſtle thus applies the like promiſe in Heb. 13. 5. for comfort to al the faithfull, that God in particular

ſayd to Abraham, I will be thy God, and the God of thy ſeed, Gen. 17. 7. and therein you expound it literally and ſpiritually. I would be contently to ſee you add ſomewhat more, the meaning of it is this; that God made his covenant with the faithfull man or faithfull woman; and their infants begotten of their bodies: but that literally the meaning is, I will be God unto this Abraham, and thy ſeed according to the fleſh, to give them the land of Canaan, Gen. 17. 8. and ſpiritually the meaning is, I will give unto Abraham the father of the faithfull and of thine, are his ſpiritual ſeed, everlaſting if not

lished made to Joshua in Josh. 1. which was this, I will not leave thee nor forsake thee. And David did so apply it to himself. Psal. 138. 6. These examples teaches how to apply Gods promises.

Concerning your explication of this promise, *I will bestow it* &c. ap-
plied not only to Abraham, but perverteth by the Lords meaning: he
made his everlasting covenant with Abraham and his seed. Gen. 17. 17.
promised also unto him and his seed the land of Canaan, Gen. 12. 8.
signifying this promise of Canaan, to that everlasting covenant, with this
copulative (*and*), the everlasting covenant being common to Abraham
with all the faithful and their seed: but his promise of Canaan proper to
him and his seed, as according to the course of nature, should proceed out
of this loynes, and therefore it cannot be, that this covenant and the
promise of Canaan should be one and the same, as you expound it. Be-
cause God made this promise to Abraham concerning Canaan and con-
firmed the same unto him. Gen. 15. 7. 18. thirteen yeares at the least
before circumcision was commanded. Gen. 16. 14. and 16. 3. 3. 4. 16.
compared with Gen. 17. 1. 10. 23. 26. and that solemn establishing of
that everlasting covenant with Abraham. Gen. 17. 7. at which tyme in-
duced this promise of Canaan was again renewed. Also it is further to be
noted, that Canaan was to Abraham and his seed a type, and as it were a
forerun of the promise of the heavenly country, which they sought at
Heb. 4. 8. 21. and 11. 9. 30. 13. 16. 29. for els had their possessing
of it made them in no better estate then the Canaanites before them, nay
not in so good an estate as divers other peoples, which enjoyed their coun-
tries more quietly, then they did Canaan.

And show me (say you) that God said to every faithful man and woman, *For me he will be God with them and their seed.* I have shewed it before, that so

the promise is to be applied, & to bid Lidia & the taylor apply it, as by the joining of their families with baptisme together with thelves appeareth. And concerning women the Apostle saith in Ch. *we are all one, there is neither Jew nor Greeke, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, whereby appeareth that God in giving his cov. hath no respect of sex, be they male or female, all is one in C. & therefore P. administered the seal to Lidia, being a woman & to her familie as well as to Stephans & the taylor. You say

*Gal. 3.1

...and confirms as **fact** that the covenant with Isaac, **unto the infants of the faithful** because of their **faith**, **Isaac etc.** **How the covenant pattern to the infants of the faithful by the free gift of God is lawed before;** pag. 77.

one mans sayth cannot conferre to the covenant of another, neither can one
 some cut off another from the covenant, but the shall thus flourish and the

Although that one mans sayth cannot by any natural operation or qua-
 lity (as a medicine doth health to the bodie) convey the covenant to an-
 other, nor actually apply justification to the soul of an other in that sense
 as the Apostle speaketh thereof Gal. 3. 10. yet according to the Lords dis-
 pensation of his covenant, the promise is received by the sayth of the Pa-
 rents to themselves and their seed, as it was by Abraham, Gen. 17. 7. 13.
 Heb. 11. 17. Rom. 4. 11. And this would be no mysterie unto you, if you
 did distinguish between the outward manner of Gods dispensation of his
 covenant (under which all the saythfull and their seed are comprehended
 and accounted Gods people) and the inward and hidden application of
 the things promised, whereof none yong nor old are partakers, save the
 elect, no nor the aged, though they be held for saints in the sight of
 men.

As for one mans sinne to cut off another, we hold it not in that sense as
 you mean, yet in some sense it is not altogether untrue; for did not such as
 Corahs children as departed not from their fathers synne parish with him,
 Numb. 16. 27. 32. And God sayth I wil visit the sinnes of the fathers up-
 on the children of them that hate him; in justice withdrawing his grace
 from the seed of the wicked; but that the personal synne of one shall cut
 off an other, as the prophet meaneth Eze. 18. 20. we defend is not.

Neither wil it availe to plead that the covenant made with Abraham, was an
 everlasting covenant, for beith *eternum* in the original, doth not import a covenant of
 everlasting continuance, but a covenant that continueth his proper tyme.

I answer it doth import a covenant of everlasting continuance and so
 doth *eternum* an everlasting tyme, as in these places: Psal. 136. 1. Ecc. 1. 2.
 5. Psal. 145. 13. Isa. 45. 17. and so in divers other places. Also the
 Lord in Gen. 17. 7. speaketh of that thing which is everlasting viz. to be
 God to Abraham and his seed after him, and therefore *eternum* must needs
 be understood for ever, unless you wil say that God was God to Abraham
 and his seed but for a tyme, for that is the covenant which there he callith
 everlasting.

And Christ proveri the resurrection from the words, *I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham.* &c. *Eternum* Ergo the co-
 venant made with Abraham is an everlasting covenant. And though you
 say do sometymes signifie a tyme that hath an end, as it doth in the type,

concerning the baptizing of infants

79

noteth tyme everlasting in the faith of those types, and therefore Canaan called an everlasting possession. Gen. 17. 8.

But be it granted (say you) that the covenant made with Abraham, Gen. 17. 9. is the everlasting covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ, whose church it follow because it was with Abraham and the faithful, whether Jewes or Gentiles believing actually, as Abraham the father did, therefore it is made with the faithful, &c. and with his children begotten of his body, &c. I demie it utterly.

Yes, it will and must follow, els are not the faithful partakers of Abraham's covenant, for if Abraham have it to him and his seed, and the believers only to themselves, then is it not the same neither in the giving nor receiving thereof, as before is proved. And if you graunt Abraham's infants, as Isaac &c. were to be esteemed his seed in respect of the covenant made with him in Christ (for to deny it by any colour of scripture you cannot) then must the same account be made of al other infants of believers, seeing the faithful are to apply the covenant to them and their seed, in the same faith that Abraham did to him and his.

Because the seed is but one, to whom the promises were made, viz. Christ, or the church of believers.

The words of the Apostle are these, *But to thy seed, as of one, which is Christ.* Gal. 3. 16. We understand by seed, the church, Christ mystically, as 1 Cor. 12. 12. gathered of Jewes and Gentiles, which grow together in one body in Christ, the seed of Abraham, as ver. 18. According to which exposition both young and old members of the church are understood to have the promise made unto them that are partakers of salvation, yea infants, els are they not sanctified by Christs death. But if by seed, be understood the redeeming church, which is C. it is he in who both the elder people & infants are blessed.

But you to prove that by one, onely actual believers is to be minded, ledge Eph. 3. 17. where it is to be noted, that Paul intendes not to shew that none are in Christ, save onely actual believers, (for that were to condemn al infants) but he speaking to the church, and such of them as were capable of instruction, and having exhorted them not to faint because of troubles, prayeth the Lord, *that they may be strengthened with his spirit, that Christ may dwell in their hearts by faith*, that is bring forth the fruits of the spirit, resisting their fayth, and so continue constant. Now it is to be observed, that "Christ dwelleth in al his, by his spirit, and thereby joyneth himself unto him, and so in infants, els are they not Christs, & this should

you have

† Ab. 2. 9.

* Gal. 3. 16.

* Eph. 3. 17.

26.

* Re. 3. 9. 11.

Job. 3. 24.

* Rom. 8. 9.

M

you have minded as well as the other, and have knowen, that a small beleeving and the practise of other Christian duties, is the work of the spirit, as the act of reasoning is of the soule, in the elder sort, required of them, and not of infants, as oft inough hath bene shewed. But not minding the true meaning of the Apostle, you thus object.

1. If the covenant be made with the faithful who actually beleeve as one seed, & the infants of the faithful carnally begotten, which is an other seed, &c. then the covenant is made with the seedes which are many, and that is directly against the Apostle, Gal. 3. 16.

I answer, that the covenant is made with the faithful, and their seed as of one kind, God of his free grace elating the beleevers and their seed in one and the same covenant of life, both of them becoming * spiritual or holy seed, and sonnes of God, by vertue thereof: and not two contrarie seedes, as you would pretend: and therefore the Apostle is not contrarie to that we affirme, for as he sayth, *the seed is one*; so say we, whether, Christ our Saviour be thereby understood, or the Churches united into one, or all beleevers, who together with their children are after a spiritual maner the sonnes of God.

Therefore that one seed is of persons actually beleeving, &c. Rom. 4. 11. whose this Argument may be framed, Abraham is father of all them that beleeve actually: infants do not beleeve actually: Ergo, &c.

Your conclusion ariseth from false premisses, which are answered before to the former Proposition of this argument, I answer, that Abraham is called the father of all that beleeve, but in no place of the scripture is added, of them onely that actually beleeve, which you do insinuate, & therefore thereby deceit in your proposition. God promised his blessing to Abrahams seed, which cōprehends his infants, & to blesse the house of Israel, not only the elder sort. That promise of blessing the families, Ge. 12. 3. & 28. 14. Act. 31. 25. Esa. 49. 22. Ser. 31. 1. includeth childrē, for they are of the family.

Again, Abrahams covenant was onely to Abrahams one seed, that is to all beleevers: Infants do not actually beleeve, Ergo, &c.

This Argument is the same in effect with the former, the maior in your understanding is false: the faithful and their children in respect of the covenant, are but of one seed. Children though they cannot actually beleeve, yet are they accounted of the beleevers, and partakers of the promise with their parents.

Again, They that are the children of Abraham do the works of Abraham: Infants cannot do the works of Abraham, Ergo, &c.

The Proposition is false in your understanding. Paul saith, if any would, he should not bate, 2 Thes. 3. 10. intendeth not this against children: neither doth our Saviour Christ, when he sayth, if you were Abrahams children, ye would do the works of Abraham. Ioh. 8. 39. but both places are to be understood of such as be of yeres, not of infants, which are not come to that strenght to work good or evil.

Again, I reason thus, They that are not under the everlasting covenant made with Abraham shall not be baptised: infants are not under the everlasting covenant with Abraham, Ergo, &c.

The minor is false: Infants are under the everlasting covenant, as be-fore is proved, and therefore to be baptised. This your reason implies the condemnation of infants, for if they be not under the covenant of Abraham, there is for them no promise of salvation.

Argument V.

1. Cor. 10. 1. 2. If the infants of the Israelites were baptised in the cloud and in the sea as well as their parents, what letteth the infants of beleeving parents vnder the Gospel to be likewise partakers of baptism as well as they?

The former the Apostle affirms 1 Cor. 10. 1. 2. and therefore good warrant must be shewed that our infants are cut off from this priviledge that the Iewes children had. And if the former baptism of the Iewes was a type of our baptism, the must there be an agreement between the type and the thing typed, which is not, if our children be not baptised as well as theirs.

The depriving of our children of the Sacrament, is to shorten the Lords bountie towards his people of the new Testament; that being denyed to their children which God gave to his people and to their infants under the law, is to deny them (in regard of their seed,) the like assurance and comfort which the Israelites had of theirs. And so to make our estate worse and more uncomfortable than theirs was. And yet the Prophets prophecied of the grace that should come to us, and did inquire & search after the time, 1 Pet. 1. 10.

Glad tydings were preached to Abraham and his seed, to infants of eight dayes old. Gal. 3. 8. And this before Christ came in the flesh, and therefore much more he being come, is joyfull tydings, brought unto us & our infants. And so are we to beleeve that the grace of God is not lessened eyther towards us or our children, but enlarged by his comming.

M. Smyth.

To this Argument I make answer, by framing the like Argument. If their infants did eat the same spiritual meat and drink which the parents eat then why may not our infants being able to eat and drink, eat & drink the Lords Supper, who former the Apostle affirmeth: 1. Cor. 1. 2. Therefore good warrant must be shewed that our infants are cut off from that privilege &c.

R. Clyfton.

1. Cor. 11.
25. 28.

This is not to answer the Arg, for first our infants must come to such abilitie as that they can shew forth the Lords death; do it in remembrance of him, and can examine themselves and discern the Lords body. before they receive the Lords Supper, which conditions were not required of all that did eat Man, and drink of the rock.

2. The proportion holdes not, for Man, and water, were not onely given to Israel to be to them a sacrament: but also served for their ordinarie corporal food, and so is not the bread and wyne in the Lords supper.

3. If things be compared alike, our sacraments to their ordinarie sacraments, no such consequence can be gathered as you intend: for the infants of Israel were circumcised, but did not eat the passeover, until they were able to go to that place which God had appointed for the eating thereof, and to eat it according to the Lords ordinance: and so much we will graunt for the Lords supper, that they are to eat it, that can eat it according to Christs institution.

4. If infants in partaking of those former Sacraments, were in them partakers of Chr, why shal not our infants also in the use of the sacrament of baptisme

concerning the baptizing of infants.

of Baptisme be held partakers of the things signified. being (as you say) those sacraments were types of ours) the truth must be as veritable to the type.

Again, I answer more properly thus, that there shall be a proportion between the type and the truth: that baptisme of the cloud and the sea; and our baptisme, viz. that of young and old carnal Israelites were baptised in the cloud and sea; so young and old spiritual Israelites shall be baptised by the baptisme of repentance.

First, I deny that the Israelites considered as they were accounted worthy to partake of the sacraments were carnal, but spiritual and holy.

1. Under the type you have young and old in years: so if you would keep proportion must be the like under the truth. But this you deny, and make two sorts of believers young and old.

Now I ask you whom you call young and old Israelites, and is any that believes may defer his baptisme, until he be old in sayth? And if this be *not lawful, and one but young believers be baptised, how will your proportion stand between the type, & the thing signified?

3. Their baptisme in the cloud and sea did preach unto them repentance, as well as our baptisme doth unto us, and in this there is a similitude between them: but that our outward baptisme, is the truth of that former baptisme in the sea and cloud; to the Israelites, I desire it may be proved.

Lastly, I would know, whom you mean, by *Spiritual fathers and their spiritual children*?

Before you calld Abraham the father of the saythful and all believers his children. But thus to make up a proportion between your type and truth, you are driven to acknowledge other spiritual fathers, besides Abraham; which being so, you must grant that they are then so called in respect of their children to whom the covenant is conveyed by Gods free grace together with them: For if the children come into the covenant by their own sayth, and enter as did their parents, then are they Abrahams children, not theirs, according as the scripture speaketh (Rom.

ix. 11. that, he shall be the father of them that believe.)

Further I say, that our infants shall have a priviledge far greater, then the infants of the Israelites had by their typical baptisms.

For they by us were onely baptised into Moses, and the law; that by us they might have Moses, and in Moses the truth in Christ, as it were under a vail: but our infants under the Gospel shall have the dayles instruction and education of faithful parents.

The Apostle sayth in 1 Cor. x. 2. that, *all the Israelites were baptised unto Moses*.

M 3

Moses

Of the fifth Argument

Moses in the cloud and in the sea. But sayth not as you say, *into the Law*; these sacraments were seals unto them of the covenant of salvation, not of the law, which then was not given. Secondly, to be baptised unto Moses may thus be understood, viz. that they were baptised, Moses being their guide, or minister by whom they were instructed in the wayes of God. Thirdly, the baptism of the Israelites howsoever it might be typicall in some respect, yet did it signifie unto them true things, whereof they were partakers. Lastly, the infants under the law and before, I had their dayly education by saythful parents, as wel as ours have under the Gospel: so that in this respect, there is no such material difference, as you pretend.

Moreover I deny that the baptism of the cloud and sea, was a type of the external baptism of the new Testament in the abstract: but it was a type of our baptism in the concrete; that is, the baptism of the cloud did type out our baptism in the three partes thereof, viz. 1. the baptism of the spirit, 2. the declaration of sayth and repentance, the antecedent of the baptism with water, 3. the outward washing with water, a manifestation of the foresaid particulars &c.

Here you set us down types & things typed, but no proofs thereof. I know that the Sacraments of the new Testament, did succeed the Sacraments of the old, confirming to us the same spirituall things that theirs did to them. But how these did type forth ours in the concrete (as you speak) I conceive not: our sacraments are external as wel as theirs, and administered by man, who neither doth nor can administer the spirit. 1. For the baptism of the spirit, "they were partakers thereof," and I manifested their sayth and repentance as we do. 2. concerning the declaration of sayth and repentance to be a part of the sacrament of baptism, I see no warrant; seeing it is more general then the sacrament it self, and is an imperfect work in man, and sometymes hypocritical, and therefore cannot be a part of the seal of Gods covenant that shal confirme sayth. Also this were to teach, that the assurance and pledge of mans salvation depends upon himself, if the declaration of his sayth and repentance, be held a part of the sacrament.

Again, sayth and repentance is that condition of the covenant that is required on our part, and therefore not a part of the seal thereof. Besides, that which is often to be repeated cannot be a part of baptism; confession of synne and sayth is so often to be repeated as there shal be occasion, Ergo &c. 3. The outward washing with water, being administered to the saythfull or their

concerning the baptizing of infants.

in the name of the Father &c. is that sacrament of baptism which is administered by John, and is administered by the ministers of the Gospel.

Furthermore, whereas I sayd that to deprive children of baptism to shorten the Lords bounty towards his people, you answer;

That Gods bounty is as large every way to our infants as to theirs, for Gods promise of actual exhibiting and sealing the everlasting covenant to Abraham and his carnal infants, was never extant in the old Testament: neither were their parents in circumcising their infants comforted in the assured conferring of it upon their infants.

You confesse the Lord to be as bountiful towards our infants as towards the infants of the Jewes, indeed, neither comfortable to theirs or ours. Not to theirs, because (say you) the everlasting covenant was never exhibited and sealed to Abraham, and al his carnal seed. I have before shewed that the covenant was sealed up to Abraham and his infants. And that it was exhibited and sealed to him and to al the faithful see Gen. 17. 7.-13. Rom. 4. 11. Hebr. 11. 13.-39. but not so al (say you) externally, it was given to all and sealed by circumcision, though internally it was not, no more is it to all that stand members of the visible church of the new Testament. Secondly, if the parents had no comfort in circumcising of their infants in respect of the promise in Christ to be unto their infants, they had none at al in that action, for our of Christ is no true comfort: and so you make circumcision an idle signe, which indeed did preach unto them, (howsoever you think thereof) Christ the promised seed, in whom they were circumcised.

pag. 12. 13.

** Col. 2. 11.*

And circumcision did not so plainly preach Christ then, as he is preached now to infants. Your doctrine casteth infants out of Gods everlasting covenant, both under the old and new Testament, and so Christ to them is not preached at al. But what is it that now preacheth Christ to infants more plainly then circumcision did to the Jewes infants, if not baptism? How be it you make a question, how the preaching of Christ could profit infants either then in types or now in truth. And you say, neither do I think that the Lord ever intended to reach the infants anything at that instant, but afterward to learn that which circumcision signified him viz. the circumcision of the heart. And if you say, those infants baptised are to be instructed.

I answer

Of the first Argument

I answer, that in the new Testament by baptisme we manifest what we hold, *viz.* the inward baptisme, whereas in the old Testament by circumcision they had what they had not, but ought to have *viz.* the inward circumcision of the heart &c.

First, the preaching of Christ by circumcising and baptising of infants did then and doth now profite their parents by seeing the covenant confirmed to their seed. And although the infants themselves know not the use thereof, til afterward, yet it makes not the Lords ordinance, to be any more unlawful, then Christs washing Peters feet, because Peter understood it not. Yt sufficeth that the Lord commandeth the thing to be done, and that children be taught the use thereof, as they shal be capable.

Secondly, concerning that difference you make between baptisme and circumcision, affirming that by the former, *was manifest what we have &c.* and by the other, *they learned what they had not.* It is not true that you say of the circumcised, that they had not inward circumcision, for God did promise it to them and their children. Deut. 30. 6. as wel as to us. And here let it be minded, that you confesse, that the Israelites ought to have had inward circumcision, if they ought to have had it, it was by their constitution or everlasting cov. of God made with them. For otherwise how ought they have had it? then how wil you prove that their covenant was carnal which required inward circumcision? the truth agrees with it self.

Argument 6.

Math. 28. 19. If Christ gave a commandement for the publishing of his covenant and administration of baptisme the seal thereof to all nations: then are the beleiving Gentiles and their infants to receive the same. But the first is true, Mat. 28. 19. Ergo the latter also is true. Act. 13. 48. & 16. 14. 15. 32. 33.

It wil be objected against the Major, that it followes not, that the infants are any more bound to receive baptisme, then they are bound whilst they are infants to receive the word, but the word they cannot receive. Ergo,

I answer that the commandement

concerning the baptizing of infants.

element is general to all nations, and therefore as Abraham if he should not have obeyed the Lord commanding him to circumcise him self, and all his familie, yea the infants, he should grievously have rebelled against God: so whosoever of the Gentiles shall not beleev and be baptised both himself and his seed, shall have no part nor portion in the inheritance of Christ: seeing he cuts himself and his seed from the covenant of God. Genes. 17. 4. And though infants be not capable of the preaching of the covenant (which notwithstanding they are bound unto, as they shall come to yeares of discretion) yet are they capable of the seal, as before is shewed, and therefore by vertue of this general commandement, Mat. 28. 19. are to be baptised.

M. Smyth.

The errors of this Argument I wil discover in order, first I deny that Baptisme is a seal of the covenant of the new Testament. Secondly, I deny that circumcision was the seal of the everlasting covenant that was made with Abraham in respect of Christ. Thirdly, Baptisme therefore can not succeed in the place of circumcision. Fourthly, I deny that although Abraham had a speciall commandement, and circumcise his male infants, therefore Christians upon this generall commandement Mat. 28. 19. shall baptise their infants. Fifthly, I say rather the contrarie is hence proved, &c.

R. Clyfton.

This is a ready course in answering, if it might be admitted of to deny one thing after another without shewing any reason to the contrary. As for your particulars I do here brand them with the letter E. for errors, of three of them I have spoken before more particularly, the fourth is now to be answered unto, concerning the baptizing of infants upon the general commandement of Christ, Mat. 28. 19. which you deny to have warrant from that scripture: I prove it thus.

If there was a commandement given for the sealing of the everlasting covenant to Abraham and his children, then is this, Mat. 28. 19. a commandement

N

dement

covenant for the sealing thereof to us and our children. But there was a
 * commandement for the sealing of the everlasting covenant to Abraham
 and his children. Ergo &c.

The sequel of the Major I prove thus, because we have the "same Gospel
 that was preached unto Abraham, and therefore the same covenant with
 commandement for the sealing thereof to us and our children without re-
 peale: If it be denyed that the everlasting covenant was sealed to Abra-
 ham and his children by circumcision, the contrary is proved, pa. 15. 19.
 If again, it be excepted that baptisme is not a seal of the covenant, see pag.
 37. 38. and that it succeedeth circumcision. pag. 41.

Secondly, If Christ sent forth his disciples by the preaching of the Gos-
 pel to bring the Gentiles into the covenant with Abraham; then are the
 faithful amongst the Gentiles and their seed to be partakers of the seal
 thereof, for God gave unto Abraham a sealed covenant, Gen. 17. 7. &c.
 But the first is true, Gen. 12. 3. & 17. 5. Act. 3. 25. Gal. 3. 8. Ergo the
 second.

Thirdly, If Christ commanded that all such as were received into his co-
 venant should be baptised, then doth this commandement of baptising
 reach as well to the infants of beleevers, as to their parents: for the promise
 is to the beleever and his children. Act. 2. 39.

But the first is true, Mat. 28. 19. Ergo the latter.

Lastly, the outward signing & sealing of the covenant of salvation God
 hath once commanded to his people and their seed in their infancie, and
 this he did never recal: and therefore it must stand as a perpetual law unto
 us under the Gospel. Gen. 17. 12. 13. 14. Exod. 12. 48. Act. 2. 38. Rom. 4.
 11. And thus have I proved that general commandement of baptising in
 Mat. 28. 19. to include the children as well as their parents. But you
 reason to the contrary, saying:

*Because Christ commanded to baptise only those that are made disciples: therefore
 infants are by expresse prohibition excluded.*

The L. sayth not, baptise only those that are made disciples, (that is your glosse)
 but he meaneth, (as formerly is proved,) to include their children also and
 families, as afterward the Ap. "did practise, & before was observed in seal-
 ing this cov. the proselytes & their seed, by circumcision, Ex. 12. 48. the
 which practise of the Ap. & former dispensatio of this cov. might give you
 satisfaction, if the L. had not in justice withdrawn this light fro your eyes.

Lastly,

concerning the baptizing of infants.

99

Lastly, I deny that infants are capable of baptism; because they cannot confess their faith and senses, &c.

To this you have been answered, that confession is required of † the elder sort whether to be circumcised or baptised, not of their infants, and that children are capable of the cov. therefore of the seal. But I will come to your Arguments.

1. They *only* are to be baptised that are made disciples by teaching: Infants cannot be made disciples by teaching. Ergo &c.

The former proposition is false, and the contrary is proved *before, 2. Everie precept affirmative, *contraineth a negative under it.* Make disciples by teaching & baptise them, is an affirmative, containing under it, baptise not those that are not made disciples by teaching. Ergo &c.

This Argument may thus be concluded, that as the Lord commands to baptise them that are made disciples including their infants: so on the contrary, Baptise not them which are not made disciples nor their infants: & thus the negative may stand, otherwise I deny that to be the negative commandement, or that the affirmative, as you propound it, out of Mat. 28. 19. your Argument is grounded upon a false exposition of that place.

3. They that are incapable of baptism, are not to be baptised; infants are incapable of baptism: seeing baptism consisteth of the inward baptism, expressed by confession inward, and washing with water in action. Infants are incapable of the two former partes of baptism. Ergo &c.

To these parts of baptism, I have "answered: & here do affirme that infants are capable both of the inward and outward baptism. Of the inward, which is the remission of sinns and regeneration, Tit. 3. 5, 6. 7. and this you must graunt unless you deny that they can be saved? Of the outward, which is with water, into the name of the father, of the sonne, and of the holy Ghost, Mat. 3. 11. and 28. 19. and this you deny not, but seeing to graunt, in saying, *Infants are incapable of the two former parts.* For confessio, I have proved that it is not an essential part of the Sac. of baptism. And for the inward baptism, (whereof Christ, & not man is the minister, Mat. 3. 11.) that is the thing signified & sealed, by the outward signe & administration thereof: & is not found to be in al that are baptised, viz. not in hypocrites. Act. 8. 13.

4. If the new Testament be as clear and perspicuous as the old & Christ the Mediator of the new Testament, as faithful as Moses the Mediator of the old: then the persons to be baptised and the condition of baptism, are as clearly

and faithfully described in the institution of baptisme, as the person, condition and tyme of circumcision. But for paedobaptisme there is no expresse description of the person, condition or tyme of their baptisme, &c.

17. 6. I answer to the consequent of the Major, that our Saviour hath † revealed to his church the whole will of his father, which is conteyned in the Scriptures, not onely in the writings of the Apostles, but also of the prophets, which hee hath for that end, commanded us to search Ioh. 5. 39. and Peter to take heed unto, 2 Pet. 1. 19. and Paul commends to be profitable to teach, to convince, to correct, and to instruct in righteousness, &c. 2 Tim. 3. 16. 17. and therefore Gods will must not so be included in the writings of the Apostles, that the prophets be excluded; but out of them both to learn what Christ teacheth. For as the books of the new Testament do plainly declare the fulfilling of all the mysteries of our redemption: so do the books of the Old Testament speak of some things more expressly then the writings of the Apostles. But to come to the point. I answer, that it was not needful for Christ to describe things in so large manner, which before had been written, and were still to continue, as example, the sealing of the covenant, the persons yong and old that were to be signed; And such like, what needs a new repetition hereof, when the Lord purposed not to disanul them: so much as was to be altered, concerning the outward signe, Christ omitted not to declare: And therefore cannot be accused of any unfaithfulness, if he in expresse words had not commanded infants to be baptised, seeing under the old Testament they had the signe of the covenant.

Again, the Apostles writings do plainly ynough declare unto us that infants are to be baptised, as both from that commandement of Christ, Mat. 28. 19. and the practise of the Apostles in baptising of families, and by other reasons hath been shewed.

And concerning the tyme of baptising, I see no reason why you should cavil about it, more then about the tyme of administering the Lords Supper, which Christ hath not so precisely set down neither the day, nor tyme of the day for the administering thereof, as Moses did of the passeover.

And the scriptures which you cite do shew that bap. is to be administered when men enter into Gods covenant, and children entring in at the same tyme with their parents, are to be baptised at the same tyme with them, as Isaac and al Abrahams howe were circumcised* the same day with Abraham. And thus much for answer to the consequent of your major, which

concerning the baptizing of Infants

do severeth to answer your minor. But touching those scriptures which you alledge for proof of your Minor, thus I answer in general to them all: that they speak of such as came newly to the faith of the Gospel, to believe that Iesus was the Christ, who were never baptised before. And this rule I confesse to be observed to all such like as are to be received to baptisme, that they make confession of their sayth & sinnes as they did: but they serve not to teach vs to deale so towards their Infants or the Infants of beleevers that are borne within the covenant. For the condition of them that are to be admittid into the church and of them that are borne in it, is not the same as concerning the administration of baptisme, no more then it was in the Iewish Church towching circumcision; for the one is declared to come within the covenant by their owne profession; and the other to be within it, by their being borne of beleeving parents: if you had instanced an example of one that was borne in the Church of the new testament, of parents that were members thereof, whose baptizing was differd until he was able to make confessio of faith, then had you sayd more to the purpose, though in such an example there might have bene neglect, as was in Moses in circumcising his sonne.

Argument VII.

Act. 16. 15. 33. Lastly, the Apostles practise is our instructio, but they baptised not onely the maister of the familie which beleeved; but all his household, *Act. 16. 15. 33.* Therefore now also the like is to be done: and so consequently the Infants are to be baptised, for they are a part of the family, see *Gen. 28. 18.* where Ioseph had his brethren, take their father and their households and come to him. Now in *chap. 46. 5. 7.* it is sayd they caried their children and wives in chariots, noting hereby, that children were of the household, els had they no commandement to haue caried them into Egypt, see also verse 27. and *Exodus 1. 21.* it is sayd, because the midwives feared God, therefore

fore he made them howses, in 1 Tim. 5, 8. The Apostle sayth, *but that provideth not for his own & namely for them of his household he sheweth the sayth, &c.* Now I would ask if children be exempted from the howshold in any of these places. or in any other where mention is made of a particular howshold. Therefore, this Argument will prove that children were baptised, unlesse it can be shewed that they were especially exempted. And if the holy Ghost have not exempted them, who dare do it, against a general commandement of baptising al nations.

M. Smyth.

I make answer to this Argument confessing it wholly, but yet denying the consequent of your conclusion: for it doth not follow because all the household of Lidia and the Gaylor were baptised, that therefore infants were baptised, you shal see what exception I take.

R. Clyfton.

The consequence wil follow, for if the Apostle baptised whole families, then children also if there were any, seeing they are of the familie, and no where excepted, but I wil come to your exceptions, the first whereof is this.

I say though infants are a part of the familie &c. yet it doth not follow that where soever there is mention made of a familie, that, therefore that familie had infants in it, &c.

Neither doth it follow, that the families of Lidia, of the Gaylor and of Stephanas, were all of them without children, because the scripture doth not mention their children. The generall speech of baptising the howshold, satisfies you not, except it be proved that there were infants therein: and why should not you (that stands for actual beleeving before baptisme) as we prove that Lidas familie did beleeve as the mistresse did, of whom onely it is sayd, that the Lord opened her hart, and she attended unto

concerning the baptizing of infants.

101

the things which Paul spake. The Actes of Christ and his Apostles are summarily recorded, and not every thing that was done at large explayned.

Certainly, if the Apostle had minded that children were not to be baptized, he would not have spoken so indefinitely of the family: yea hereby he teacheth that in the administration of this sacrament: he followed the custom *practise used in circumcising of the whole family when the governor thereof received the faith.

*Gen. 17
-13. Exod.
12. 41.

2. By this reason you might prove that Lydias husband and the Gaylors wife and their children of 40. yeres old and their servants of 60. yeres old were baptized, &c.

First, it is a question whether Lydia had a husband, and more like that he was a widow, because it is sayd to be her household. 2. Concerning the Gaylors wife, their children and servants, what letteth that they might not be baptized, if they refused not the grace of God offered? The Apostle preached salvation to the whole family, and the Gaylor beleaved, and he with all that belonged unto him were baptized. Dare you now except against any in that family, seeing the holy Ghost so speaks? from these general teachings I prove that all in both households were baptized, shew the contrary if you can.

1. Act. 16
31. 32.

3. If it were yielded that there were infants in Lydias family and in the Gaylors, did it follow that they were baptized? no thing les, and that I will declare thus. 1. Touching the baptizing of the Gaylors wife and children of yeres of discretion, there was necessarily required faith and repentance, or els they were not baptized: so say I because infants cannot beleave and repent, though they were in the family, yet they shall not be baptized.

I might ask you where I so sayd of the Gaylors wife and children, but I will not contend with you about it. Concerning infants, I have proved that their baptizing is not to stay, until they can themselves make confession of their faith and finnes, and you do not yet say any thing worth answer, to the contrary.

2. I say, that although it be said, that all that percometh to the Gaylor were baptized yet it is also sayd, verse 32. that the word was preached to all that were in his house & verse 34. that all his household beleaved &c. seeing therefore all that were baptized in the Gaylors house beleaved by the preaching of the word. Infants that could not beleave were not baptized, &c.

First, all that you here say doth not prove that all that were baptized in the Gaylors

Gaylor

gallions house be loved by the preaching of the word. The word was preached to all in his house; that were able to understand, and so must needs be understood of such. But Paul speaking of baptizing them, sayth, that he was baptised and all that belonged unto him. Which speech must needs include his little children also, if he had any.

And although it be said, that he rejoiced that he with all his household believed in God, yet wil it not follow hereupon, that his children were not baptised, seeing children are to be esteemed in the number of believers. And those words may have this construction, viz: that he rejoiced, that he with all his familie were received into the fayth of Christ, or were accepted into the number of believers, and so it includes his children.

Concerning the tyme, being midnight, which you say was a distempored tyme to witte young children, it is nothing that you say above the infants of Israel awakened and caried out of Egypt at the like tyme of the night? Exod. 12. 30. Upon lesse occasion then either of these, children may be awakened.

For for Lulias familie it is not sayd that all her household was baptised, or yet if it had been so said, that everie particular person of her familie was baptised, for Acts. 3. 1. It is sayd, that Peter went down to John and he was baptised of him, &c. yet howe it cannot be concluded that all and every one that were with him were baptised. &c.

The scripture sayth, that Lulia was baptised and her household without excepting of any, the like is sayd of Stephanas familie, 1 Cor. 16. 15. And by that which is written of the gayther house, we are taught how to understand the Apostle. And be it that this word (all) be used sometimes for many, as in that of Mat. 3. 9. What then yet it followes not: therefore, it is so to be taken in this place of the Apostle, seeing he useth it for every particular of the whole in all these places, 1 Cor. 15. 10. Hebr. 1. 6. Gal. 3. 28. 1 Cor. 12. 13. 1 Cor. 14. 22. 1 Cor. 15. 22. 1 Cor. 15. 23. and in divers others.

But you say, As Acts. 16. 32. 34. onely they that believed were baptised, & were with them of Lulias familie.

You are to bold with the text to add unto it. The Apostle sayth not, that onely they that believed were baptised, but that they preached to all that were in his house, and were baptised with all that were therein. Next, you proceed to conclude two Arguments against baptising of infants, the former is this.

The Apostles practise is our instruction, but the Apostle in baptising households,

Princeded all that were in the family, and then they believing were baptized. And they only that by the preaching of the word were converted and believed were baptized.

This argument might have bene granted, had not the conclusion contained more then the former propositions, viz. this word, (only) which ought to have bene placed in the one of them, and if in the assumption, then were it false to say, that only they that believed were baptized and no more: the places wherevpon this argument is grounded are answered before. And it is to be further observed, that this was the Apostles practise to such as were of yeares and not before of the Church. Your other Argument is this.

That which the Apostles practised in one family, they practised in all families that they baptized: But in the Gaylors family according to Christs commission, Mat. 28. 19. they first made them Disciples by preaching the word, Mat. 10. 32. 34. Ergo. &c.

This argument also may be granted, and maketh nothing against the baptizing of infants, except your heretical collection which I deny. And this may suffice for reply to your answer to this & the rest of my arguments.

OF THE TESTIMONIE OF THE fathers concerning the baptizing of infants.

Herevnto I will adioyne some testimonies of the fathers, not to prove that children ought to be baptized, which is to be done, & is by the scriptures already proved: but to shew the practise hereof in auncient Churches. Augustine (as I find alledged) writing to Ierome, epist. 23. sayth, Cyprian not making any new decree: but firmly observing the faith of the Church judged with his fellow Bishops, that as soone as one was borne, he might lawfully be baptized. See Cyprian epist. to Fidus. And writing against the Donatists, lib. 2. cap. 21. & 22. sayth, that the baptizing of infants was not derived from the authority of man, neither of councils, but from the tradition or doctrine of the Apostles. Cui, vpon

Lev. Cha: 8. approveth the baptisme of infants and condemneth the iteration of baptisme. Origine upon the Rom. sayth, *that the Church received baptisme of infants from the Apostles.* Nazianzenus in Orat. in S. Lavacrum. 3. sayth, *that baptisme agreeth to every age, to every condition of life, to all men if thou hast an infant, it is sanctified from his infancy, yea from the finger ends it is consecrated.* After he sayth, *some man will say what sayest thou of infants which neither know what grace is nor payne, what shal we baptise those? & he answereth, verily.* Amb. lib. 2. de Abraham cha. 11. Speaking of baptisme, sayth, *neither old man nor Proselyte, nor infant is to be excepted, because every age is guilty of sinne and therefore stands need of the Sacrament.* These & many other of the fathers do beare witnesse according to the Scriptures of the lawfulness of the baptizing of infants.

but I desire you to shew where I produce the fathers contrary to the Scriptures, or where I produce the fathers against the Scriptures.

And for *Chilston* you produce the fathers, I say that the producing of fathers, who all of them held plenty of Antichristian heresies, shall avail you nothing in your cause, and you that deny the testimonie of fathers contrary to the Scriptures, how can you wish any colour produce fathers against us in case contrary to the Scriptures &c.

But I will produce the testimonies of the fathers against you.

R. Clifton

I plead not for the errors of the fathers, but for the truthe which they held according to the Scriptures; And where you charge them to hold plentie of antichristian heresies, you tax them very deeply, and you that so censure others, had need to judge your selfe, otherwise the Lord will find out a sentence against you. Also I desire you to shew where I produce the testimonie of the fathers contrary to the Scriptures, you are grown to be very careless what you affirm. For my producing of the fathers against you, I do not recall that I have done, seeing their testimonie is the truth, who shew the practise of their times, according to the Scriptures.

concerning the baptizing of infants

1677

I know the device of your producing of fathers. viz. 1. to set a glosse upon your Anabaptist heresy of baptizing infants. 2. to draw the world into dislike of the Lords Church. But if any should produce testimonies of the fathers against your separation from us in the case of Prelacy &c. what would you answer, would you not say they are testimonies of men living in corrupt times, &c. even so say I to you &c.

Here I charge you with blaspheming the ordinance of Christ in calling the baptizing of infants, antichristian heresy, two to him that speaks evil of good, as with sinne, in saying it is my device to produce the fathers to set a glosse upon my antichristian heresy, &c. for were it a falselhood that I defend (as I know it is not) yet know you that my soule is free from such wicked intention to produce the fathers in that behalf. It is one thing to produce the testimony of the fathers witnessing the truth according to the scripture, & another, for the defence of errors: the latter we reiect, & you take vp, but the former we approve and you condemne. And although we are not to build our sayth vpon the fathers; yet for matter of fact done in their times we may give credit to their report: and so their testimonie serves to prove something, namely to shew the practise of their times to which end I did alledge them, and that is not to confesse that they prove nothing as you charge me. And say Remember that, and let all men take notice, that you produce testimonies, that you say prove nothing. And I pray you remember with what spirit you writ these words.

But why do you produce testimonies of the fathers, for sooth to shew the practise of ancient Churches. But all these Churches were Antichristian by your owne confession, &c.

Yea Sir, I do produce them to shew the practise of Ancient Churches, whose testimonies is not so lightly reiected, save of you and such like, that condemne all Churches for antichristian, except such Heretical Synagoges as your owne is. As concerning these ancient Churches in the first two hundred yeares after Christ, albeit some devises of men crept in, and as they grew elder so increased, yet that they were Antichristian, where have you my confession? it is strange that you dare asseme such untruthes. And for antichristian antiquitie & universality, I could wish you were as free fro Anabaptistical novelitie, as I am fro approving of any error or superstition either for the antiquitie or universality of it, the truth we desed needs no such Popish propps: but yet antiquitie (when the thing is found to be true that is ancient) is not lightly to be regarded seeing the truth is more ancient then error.

And although you esteeme not of the testimony of the fathers witness against you, yet haue you summoned together such men as you thought would give any countenance to your error, to batle against both the Scriptures and them: but their testimony doth little pleasure you, as shall appeare by the examination of the particulars. The first you alledge is, *Hier. Pontician Chro. fol. 6. who saith, that Victor Apher. anno 193. ordained that at Easter it should be indifferently administrated to all, whereupon gather, that before his time onely such as were catechised in the faith were baptised, for he would not decree that heathen should be baptised.*

This man (I take his words upon your report) doth mention Victor's decree for the time of administration of baptism to all yong and old, viz. at Easter. But would any but you inferre hereupon, that baptism was not administrated before this time to infants? You might aswel say that before that time it was not administrated to the elder sort, for he speaks in general of the persons to be baptised. Victor brings not in baptising of infants, which was then the Churches practise, but prescribes a certaine time for the general administration of that sacrament: as Gelasius did the like anno 494. That infants were baptised before Victor's time, appeareth by that *of Higinius, who decreed that children which were to be baptised should haue a Godfather and a Godmother: Anno 143. Higinius lived before Victor, about 50. yeres. Your next, *Eusebius Hist. lib. 7. cap. 8. saith that. Novatus rejected the holy baptism and overthrowed the faith and confession which was accustomed before baptism: whereby it appeareth that faith and confession were required before baptism: and therefore the rudiments thereof still remaine that in the baptising of infants, a confession of sinne and faith is required of the suretie or parents.*

That confession was required before the baptising of men growne to yeres and newly cometo the faith is not denyed, and more then this can not be gathered from Eusebius words as you set them downe. But what is this against the baptising of infants? Howbeit I find not this of Novatus in Lib. 7. chap. 8. but in that chapter mention is made of a certain faithful brother that being present when some were baptised and heard what was demanded and what was answered, weeping, &c. began to confesse that he had otherwise received baptism of Hereticks &c. Now if he was baptised of Hereticks without confession of his faith, it was contrary to the practise of the Church, & of the Apostles concerning such as came newly to the faith.

Eusebius ecclesiastical hist. lib. 6. c. 33. thus writeth of Novatus, the

concerning the baptizing of infants.

being vexed with an unclean spirit in his youth, and having spent time with Exorcists, fell into a great sickness, and lying in his bed, for necessity he was pressed, neither any of those things which were accustomed to follow baptism were solemnly fulfilled, &c.

As for the rudiments of this confession, which you say still remaines hereunto I answer, that this practise is a kind of imitation of that which was observed in former times towards them of yeres: and it may be that the parents which brought their children to be baptised did make some short confession of their faith (for of confessing of syn is no step remaining that I know, onely a promise to forsake sinne) which after did grow (as other things) into corruption.

Againe, you alledge *Eusebius lib. 10. cap. 15.* reporting a story of one that did baptise children in sport, and that *Alexander Bishop of Alexandria*, though done in sport, yet finding that the children had questioned and answered according to the manner of the catechumens in baptism, did approve it, where by it appeareth that onely persons by confession of their faith and sinnes were admitted to baptism in *Alexandria*.

This storie I doe not find in that chapter before quoted, but such alike in chap. 14. yet both your written copie and printed book, appoints to ch. 15,

If you meane that of *Athanasius* baptising of certaine Carechumens lib. 10. c. 14. I answer that those children so baptised seeme not to be any children of the Church but some of the heathen which with their parents were instructed in the faith, but not yet in communion or baptised. Againe, in that they being thus baptised were by the Bishop delivered to his Church to be brought up, their parents thereto consenting: which consent the Bishop needed not to have required; or so committed those children to be educated, if they and their parents had bene already of the Church, for to them then had this care apperteyned. Besides if none but the elder sort had bene baptised (which by that which is here objected is not proved) yet was this but the practise of one particular Church which might be rained with that error about baptising of infants, as *Tertullian* and some others were in those times.

Next you alledge *Hosius Patriarch. Confess. de fide cap. 27.* saying, that these Apostolical traditions which the Scripture teacheth not, are, that there are 3. persons and one God; and that *Dionysius & Origen* do teach the baptizing of infants to be an Apostolical tradition. Now you know their Apost. traditions were Antichristian inventions.

This witnesse will do you little pleasure: for as he calleth the baptisme of infants a tradition, so doth he the Trinitie, which the scripture doth manifestly teach in sundry places. Now if you accept not his testimonie in calling the Trinitie a tradition, why do you produce him against baptising of infants? Besides though this man was a Papist, yet is his witnesse with us, for calling the baptisme of infants an Apostolical tradition, he meanes as the Papists do, such doctrines of the Apostles as were not written which they hold equall with the scriptures. Againe, this he sayth is so called by Dionisius and Origen, who understood thereby the doctrine of the Apostles: And those Apostolical traditions (whereof you dream) were not in their times in esse.

Polydore Vergil, you bring in also to testifie, that it was the use with the Ancients, that persons of yeres (seve) in a manner should be baptised clad with white garments &c. and this was performed at Easter and Whitsontide, &c.

This witnes tells us that it was in use with the Ancients not onely to baptise the elder sort that turned to the faith, but appointed them to be clad in white, & that they were instructed untill Easter, (their time appointed for baptism): & these it seemes were the Catechumeni (for in those former times many had not imbraced the faith) now this authour sayth not that children borne in the Church were kept unbaptised until they could make profession of their owne faith, whereof our dispute is.

The wordes of Lactantius (whom you also cite) are generall of yong & old, whose testimonie may serve to fit up the number, but proves not your desire, his words you set downe thus *Candidus egrediaur nitidis exercitus undis: atque vetus vitium purgat in amne novo*, which may be understood of infants as well as of the elder sort.

Concerning Lodovicus Vives, vpon August. de Civir. Deicap. 27. (if he have words tending to any such purpose for which you alledge him, seeing he is but a late writer, I would know out of which of the Ancients he proveth that he sayth, certainly fro that place of Augustine he can gather no such thing as you set downe in his name.

Lastly, you cite Erasmus in his annotations vpon the fift of the Romanes to say, *Thou in Pauls time it was not received, that infants should be baptised*.

Erasmus brings no proof for that he sayth, and therefore being of so late time, what is his witnes against so many fathers testifying the contrarie. Thus in alledging of him and the rest, you shew the weaknes of your

...that have not one auncient father directly to witnes with you, but
we driven to call them to witnes that in this thing were of contrary judg-
ment to your selfe.

REASONS AGAINST

Baptising of infants, answered.

R. Clifton

Now letvs come to consider of the reasons alledged to the co-
trarye, the first of them is this.

1. Reason:

*Because there is neyther precept nor example in the new Testament of
any infants that were baptised by Iohn or Christs Disciples, only they that
did confesse their sinnes and confesse their faith were baptised. Mar. 1.
4. 5. Act. 8. 37.*

Answer

1. This reaso being brought into form will bewray the weaknes
therof, for suppose it should be granted that there was neither a
speciall comandement or example in the practise of Iohn or
Christs Disciples for the baptising of infants, yet it may not with-
standing be lawfull to baptise them, namely if by sound cōsequēce
it may be gathered out of the Scripture. And this may be done
by good warrant fro the exāple of our Saviour Christ, *Mar. 28. 31. 32*
who reasoning against the Saduces concerning the resurrection,
proves it by Argument necessarily drawn from *Exod. 3. 6.* where
no such thing was expressly mentioned, and thus he taught usu-
ally and refuted his aduersaries, as the historie of the Gospel wit-
nesseth. After the same manner doth Paul in his epistles to the
ROMANES and GALATHIANS prove iustification by faith
only without works of the law, this he did not prove by alled-
ging any place in all the old testament in playne termes affirming
so much,

to much, but by conclusion of necessarie consequence from the scriptures. And to this purpose might diuers other instances be alledged. So likewise if we prove the baptising of infants by vnanswerable arguments out of the old and new testament, (though wee can not shew any playne precept or example) yet may upon warrant thereof, not feare to baptise them. For the author of this reason himselfe can not deny, that both he and we must beleeve diuers things which we gather out of the Scriptures, by necessary consequence that we shal not find in expresse words, as that there be 3 persons in one Godhead, that the son is *Homousius*, that is, of the same substance with the father, now such expresse words cannot be shewed in the scripture. And many such like.

2. Also if this Argument be sufficient to barr children from the Sacrament of Baptisme, then is it as sufficient to keepe back women from the Lords Supper, but the lawfulness thereof is onely proved by consequence, because they are within the covenant and are partakers of the Sacrament of baptisme. Thus the weakness of this reason being manifested, I wil thirdly answer vnto it.

3. That there is both precept by Christ and example by his Disciples for the baptising of infants as hath bene proved by my two last reasons alledged to prove the lawfulness of baptising of Infants. Commandement I say, Mat. 28. 19. *Goe teach al nations baptising them*, where is no exception of the Children of faithfull parents. And therefore there being a lawe once given that the covenant should be sealed to the infants as well as to the beleving parents, the same lawe of sealing the covenant, must stand stil in force to the parties (though the outward signe be changed) except the lawemaker do repeal it, or have set downe some ground for the repeal thereof, which must be shewed, or els this commandement doth bind vs and our infants to receave this seal of the covenant.

And

baptising of infants, answered.

111

And as for examples, we read that the Apostle baptised Lidia & her household. Act. 16. 15. and the Gayler and al that belonged unto him vers. 33. both which seeming to be great households, it is not likely that they were without children though the Evangelist mentiō them not. But the exceptiō is, that only such as did cōfesse their sins & confesse their fayth were baptised. Concerning Iohn, he was sent to call the people to repentance and so to prepare the waye of the Lord Mat. 3. 3. and so many as did repent and confesse their sins, he baptised: but did Iohn refuse their children if they brought them to him? but it wilbe sayd there is no mention made that he did baptise them: no more say I, is there that they were offered unto him. There is no mention that the disciples of Christ were baptised, and yet it were too bold a part, and no doubt very false, to affirme that they were not baptised. All things that Iohn did, nor that Christ did in the particulars are written. Ioh. 20. 30. but the summe thereof. And therefore to gather an Argument from hence, because there is no mention that children were baptised of Iohn, therefore they ought not to be baptised, is a larger conclusion then the premisses will bear: and so that reason taken from the baptising of the Eunuch (Philip baptised no children when he baptised the Eunuch) is of no weight to prove that therefore children ought not to be baptised. Was not the Eunuch a stranger farr from his country, now in iourney homeward, & therefore not like that he should have his children with him, specially in such a tedious iourney, & not knowing of this accident.

M. Smyth.

Now in the next place you proceed to make answer to my three arguments against baptising of infants, so the first argument you say, if it be brought into forme, it wil be-

P

112

way the Weaknes of it, wel I wil bring it into forme &c.

That which hath neyther precept nor example is not to be done: Baptising of infants hath neyther precept nor example. Ergo. &c. Againe another part of my argument may be brought into forme thus. That which hath precept and example must be practised. Baptising of persons confessing their sins and their sayth is commanded and was practised by Christ John and the Apostles. Ergo. &c.

R. Clyfton

Parallels,
271.

First, the Major of your former Sillogisme is not necessarily true, your selfe confesseth that every consequent necessarily deduced from the scripture is as well and as truly the word of truth, as that which is in playne termes expressed, &c. and therefore you ought to have added (nor ground of the scripture) or such like.

2. The minor I deny, and haue proved that there is both precept and example for baptising of infants. Your second Syllogisme may be granted, save that the conclusion seemes to entend more then the propositions, viz, in these words, (are the persons to be baptised) as yf onely such (& not infants) as can confesse their faith, are to be baptised, which I deny.

Before you proceed to confirme your argument: you labour first to remove my answer saying. Although a necessary consequence in all cases shall prevaile, yet I say, the Lord can not leave vs in this particular to necessary consequence, he dealing plainely and faithfully with vs &c.

You graunt a necessarie consequence in all cases shall prevaile, why not in this particular. Your reason is, seeing the new Testament is more manifest then the old, &c. and Moses hath set downe distinctly and plainly the persons with their qualifications to be circumcised, &c. either Christ hath as plainly and fully set downe these particulars or els the new testament, is not so playne as the old.

1. By this your reason you iniure God & his word, who least the Jewes in the books of Moses onely to consequences towching that great point of the resurrection, which yet Christ accounted sufficient, and against the Sadduces, drewe his Argument to prove the resurrection out of Exodus, 3. 6. where no such thing is expressly mentioned, and so by your doctrine he dealt not plainely and faithfully. Also every other argument, that he or the Apostles used upon a necessarie consequence can

not stand with the open face of the gospel, thus far doth your reason extend; but I will come to your particular whereof you would have it understood, viz. that Christ can not deale faithfully, if for the baptizing of infants he hath not as plainly described the ordinance of baptism, the persons with all other circumstances, &c.

Do you thinke that if Christ have not set downe every circumstance about baptism, that he is therefore unfaithful? what think you of his describing of the other Sacrament, where is it set downe so plainly, that women shalbe partakers thereof? there is no mention that any woman was present at Christs administration of his last supper: where is the tyme so described for the administration thereof, as was for the Pascheover? must Christ for this be accused to have dealt not so faithfully as Moses? had our Saviour any need to teach or write otherwise then he hath done about the sacraments? seeing it is the same covenant under the Gospel that was sealed to the old Church, and a commaundement given for the sealing thereof unrepealed: that which was to be chaunged concerning the outward ceremonie, Christ hath plainly set it downe with direction for the administration thereof. And that which was needful for Moses in describing circumcision, was not so necessarie for Christ in describing of baptism: because circumcision was to be administred onely to the males, but baptism to both sexes; circumcision on the 8. day: baptism is tyed to no strict tyme, and therefore the particular description of these circumstances might wel be omitted, and no unfaithful dealing in Christ.

As for the minding of it to be administred to infants, there was no use of any such particular direction, seeing the Lord had once ordeyned to seal his covenant to the faithful & their seed, & reneweth the same in a general manner under the Gospel, which may suffice to all that are sober minded.

For it had bene easily said, go teach &c. baptise them, & if they have any infants baptise them, &c.

It is not for man to prescribe wisdom how to speak, things are taught plainly enough, if God give men cares to heare.

But say that, Christ Iohn and the Apostles leaveth direction for this meane matter onely by dark far fetched probable coniectures & consequence from the old testamēt, which was onely typical, &c. and hath not left evident grounds for it expressly in all the foresaid particulars, &c. is to say that Christ is not so faithful in his office propheticall as Moses was. &c.

For these things which we defend are playne enough and no dark or
 far-fetched coniectures, except to such, whose eyes the Lord hath blinded.
 Concerning our Reasons drawn from the writings of the old Testament
 we do herein follow the example of Christ & his Apostles, who did confirme
 and prove that doctrine which they preached by the Scriptures of the Pro-
 phets. Paul sayeth, that he witnessed to small and great, saying no other things than
 those which Moses and the Prophets did say should come: notwithstanding I have
 also confirmed, this doctrine of baptizing of infants from the new Testament.

In that you say, the old Testament was onely typical, you must explaine your
 meaning, for although some things were* typical vnder the old Testamēt
 yet other things were Moral, as the Moral law which was a parte of its
 preaching, prayer and other spiritual parts of worship, which were comma-
 ded vnder the old Testament. Agayne, That Christ hath left vnderstandable
 groundes in the Scriptures for the baptizing of infants, before is shewed.

Moreover saying that, the new Testament was wrapt vp and preached obscurely in
 the old Testament and types thereof, it was necessary that Christ should out of the
 old Testament, prove the resurrection &c. but now that the new Testament being
 written &c. why should we be sent to obscurities and coniectural consequents &c.

Because the bookes of the new Testament were not written, Christ and
 the Apostle might reason from obscurities & coniecturall consequents out of
 the old Testamēt: do you thus argue indeed? was Christs reasoning obscure,
 for the resurrection? do you thinke the Saduces would have bene sooner
 perswaded if the new Testament had bene written and Christ had reasoned
 from it? no more then you wilbe perswaded to beleewe the baptizing of
 infants for al the reasons we bring frome the same. He that wil not beleewe
 Moses and the prophets, wil not beleewe the Apostles. Agayne, I deny
 that to reason from the Scriptures of the old Testament is to reason from
 obscurities: the Apostles have made all things cleere and manifest, Ephe. 3.
 5-9 whose writings do further us to the vnderstanding of the prophets, &
 Christ himselfe sends vs to search those Scriptures. Ioh. 5. 39. and Peter
 sayth, I yee do wel if you take heed to the word of the Prophets as before
 is observed.

Besides, the Trinitie of persones & unitie of essence in the Godhead is proved by playne
 wordes 1. Iohn 5. 7. &c.

Tha

the baptizing of infants answered.

117

That the Trinitie is proved by this scripture and by divers other places. I deny not, yet in these expresse words, *That there be 3. persons in our God-head,* is not so let down in this place or in any other. Neither is found to be in those playn words, though the same thing may be concluded out of the scriptures. But I did instance there, to shew that every thing is not set down in so playn and expresse words as you would bear us in hand.

Finally, I say, shew me any necessary consequence for baptizing of Infants out of the old Test. or the new, and I yield.

This I have done already, but for your yeelding it is not in your owne power, but in † God that must shew mercy, and give grace, which I pray the Lord to give you, Amen. † Pbi.

Yet a reason or two I wil here adde unto my former, to prove that infants of beleevers are within the covenant: from Gal. 3. 29, thus I reason.

Whosoever are Christs are Abrahams seed & within the covenant.

The children of beleevers are Christs: Therefore Abrahams seed & within the covenant: and so consequently have right to baptisme the seal thereof. The Assumption is thus proved. Children be eyther Christs or els they * cannot be saved: But they * may be saved. Ergo * 13. 14.

2. The infants of beleevers are eyther of the church, † which is the body of Christ, or without: If within, then are they of the covenant, and Christ is theirs, for he * is given for and to his Church, and is the saviour of it: and so being of the church, baptisme must belong unto them. But if children be without the covenant, then are they "without God, without hope, and without promise of salvation; and so their estate as hethen, and the children of beleevers no more holy then the children of infidels, though Paul witnesseth the contrary. † Eph. 1. 23. * E. 2. 25. 27. 2. 18. 22. "Eph. 2. 12.

But I desire it may well be observed that, you are driven to consequents for this matter, and secondly, that, the Gospell of Christ is for babes. *Matth. 11. 25. &c.*

What except you against a necessary consequence, is not that manner of † Paralog reasoning lawful? did not Christ so reason, as before is shewed? & you your self do † justifie it. I know if you had such consequents for the baptizing of your self, you would make them go for currant, as indeed they ought. 33. *Cor. 1. 11.*

But I do not onely reason a consequentibus, but set down the expresse
 17. commandement of God, for the sealing of yong and old; and the exam-
 13. ple of the Apostle baptising whole families.

2. That the Gospel is for babes, I graunt, and that in Mat. 11. 25.
 is applyed to men of yeares, which are lowly and meek, but you must know
 Cor. 13. that the most simple persons (as you speak) are capable of the mysteries
 12. Heb of the Gospel but in * part, and every man hath his tyme of groweth ther-
 11. 14. in, and needeth to be instructed, that he " may increase in the knowledge
 6, 13. of our Lord and Saviour Iesus Christ? And though the Gospel be playne,
 Pet. 4. yet we attayn to the knowledge of it by degrees, your self wil confesse this,
 at least your many alterations do testifie thus much against your self, and
 therefore the most simple is not so capable thereof as you pretend.

Lastly, for my consequences which you cal mere hallucinations & Sophismes,
 I iustifie them against your best arguments, how well you have disproved
 them, let the good Reader iudge.

Your second Answer and exception is, that if want of special precept and exam-
 ple barre children from baptisme, it shal also barre Women from the Lords supper. I de-
 ny it, for in playn termes it is sayd, 1 Cor. 11. 28. let *Anthropos* viz. either man or
 woman eat after examination. & Gal. 3. 28. there is neither male nor female in Christ
 &c. 1 Cor. 12. 13. We have been all made to drink into one spirit, and
 Dorcas is a discipule. Act. 9. 36. and the disciples met together together to break
 bread. Act. 20. 7. &c.

That women are to be partakers of the Lords supper is no question,
 but whether there be commandement or example, expressely naming
 women, that you have not shewed from these scriptures. Concerning
 1 Cor. 11. 28. there is a word of the common gender, but the Apostle
 sayth not in plaine termes thus, let every woman examine her self and so
 eat: seing the word *anthropos*, may be applyed to the man, and is sometimes
 restrayned to man onely, as in Matth. 19. 3. is it lawfull for *Anthropos* to
 put away his wife? and Hebr. 5. 1. and every high Priest is taken ex *an-*
thropos. And in reproving of their abuse the Apostle useth words of the
 masculine gender: also the words joynd with *Anthropos*, 1 Cor. 11. 28.
 are of the masculine gender, let a man examine himself, *caution* for he that
 eateth *esthion*, &c. this compared with Christs institution where onely men
 were present, though women were in the citie, sheweth this testimonie not
 to be so plain as you pretend. Neither do the rest of your scriptures prove
 your

your desire. As for Dorcas being a disciple, is not a p^{er}fect example, the women of the Jewes were Moses disciples, yet were it not true to reason, that therefore they were circumcised. As for Gal. 3. 28. & 1 Cor. 12. 13. they speak of the spiritual union in Christ, and spiritual grafting into his body by the spirit and baptisme, but neither of them sayth, let women partake of the Lords supper.² I reason for the plaine termes, other wise I deny not, that arguments may be drawn frō these scriptures to prove that women are to receive the Lords Supper.

Tom 3. Answer and exception followeth, wherein you do affirme that there is both precept and example for baptizing of infants &c. to these I have already answered in the sixt and seventh reasons going before.

And there also may you receive satisfaction to that you have answered: but yet to one objection concerning the comandement once given, of the sealing of infants. *I answer* (say you) *besides that baptisme is not the seal of the new Testament but the spirit, and that circumcission was not the seal of the everlasting covenant &c.* So though it were granted that infants of the old Testament were by circumcission sealed to the covenant made in Christ, which I peremptorie deny, yet seeing the tyme of circumcission is expired, therefore infants are not to be sealed by baptisme.

To al this it is answered "before that circumcission as also baptisme are seals of the covenant of salvation, and though the tyme of circūcising be expired, yet is not the comādemēt of sealing of the covenant expired, &c. therefore infants are stil to be sealed with baptisme which succedeth circūcission.

*pag. 118
37. 38.*

In the last place you require profe that onely persons that confessed their sinns & their faith were baptised, I proove it thus: They onely were so to be baptised that Christ comāded to be baptised, persons made disciples by teaching, were onely commanded to be baptised by Christ. Mat. 28. 29. Ergo &c.

I deny your Assumption, the affirmative is not to baptise them onely that are made disciples by teaching, but also their seed, as formerly hath been proved: and you feighne a false negative to that affirmative, in Mat. 28. 19.

2. *Againe, considering that in every affirmative there is included a negative, therefore wheresoever example is, that persons confessing their sinns and then sayth were baptised, there is signified that those that did not confess their sinns &c. were not baptised.*

This is

This is granted of such as were of yeres, and to be added to the Church & so now to be practised towards any of the Turks or such like that should come to the faith. But this is false, that because persons confessing their faith were baptised, therefore the infants of the faithful, not able to make confession of their faith shall not be baptised. Willing confessing must be opposed to actual refusing, if the argument according to the mind of the holy Ghost stand good.

For we must know that the bodie is one &c. and the seed one and not two, for in the new Testament they know God from the least to the greatest. Heb. 8. 11. and they are all taught of God. Mat. 11. 11. and this I take to be a plaine prooffe of the point which you desire.

This serves rather to prove that children are to be baptised because they are of the same body of Christ. To affirme infants to be baptised is not to hold two seedes of contrary natures as you charge us, for as the father, so are his children partakers of the covenaut, and both are a holy seed & children of God in respect thereof, though the father professe his faith & the childe cannot, in respect of age. the father can reason, so cannot his infant, yet both of them are of the same nature, & reasonable creatures. And be it that some of the children whose parents professe the faith are not elected, so may it be also that the father that confesseth his faith is not elected, but this belongs not to us: we are to hold them as children of the covenant as the word teacheth.

2. 11.

Concerning, Heb. 8. 11. *all shall know me, &c.* it must be understood of all that are capable of knowledge: God promised a more singular grace of illumination under the gospel of those thinges which the Church had more obscurely before Christs comming: so doth he promise remission of sinnes, wherof childre are partakers, & shalbe of this heavenly knowledge also, as by yeres they shalbe able to learne, the want whereof doth no more hinder them from being partakers of Gods promise in Christ, then the want of knowledge, hinders an infant to be heire to his fathers inheritance.

But if this be an argument of force against the baptising of infants, because the Lord sayth, *I wil put my father in their hearts*: then wil this be as forceable against them that are of yeres that they need not be taught, because the same Lord sayth, *they shall not teach every man his neighbour, &c.* and so teaching shalbe overthrowen also. The true sence is to be sought after,

and

nothing to pervert scriptures as you do to your own destruction.

Touching that of Ioh. 6. 45. *they shall be taught of God*, it must be understood of al; as they are capable of instruction, the promise is made to the church Esa. 54. 13. and so to children, as also that in Hebr. 8. 11. and shall be fulfilled to every one, as they shall be able to understand.

Next upon my speeches affirming, *that of Iohn it is not said that he refused to baptise infants*, you say, *that Iohn his preaching was such as peremptorie excluded infants*, for it was the baptisme of repentance &c.

Iohns preaching of repentance, is the preaching of the Gospell which includes not children: your reason is not good, for baptisme of repentance respects the tyme to come, and not onely sins past, and byndeth the baptised to continual mortification. And both Iohn & Christ preached to the Jewes which were of the covenant, and therefore called them to repentance and taught them to beleieve that Christ was come, whom they looked for.

* *Mat. 23. 38.*

For being not regenerate &c. yet they could not enter into the kingdome of God Ioh. 3. 5.

Christ in Iohn 3. 5. speaketh of true members in his sight: we are to hold the professors with their seed to be regenerate, because they are of the covenant, until the contrary appear by their deeds.

And here it would be considered unto whom Christ and Iohn spake, unto the Jewes &c. and yet he sayd repent and beleieve. Now if the Jewes had been truly regenerate in their communion, Iohn needed not to have required such conditions of them, he in few words might have sayd, come ye u saythful and al your infants and be baptised.

1. Iohn spake to them that were of yeares and had sinned, & therefore repentance was necessarily required, not so of Infants that have not committed actual sinne. 2. The preaching of the Gospel belongs to the regenerate, I mean the preaching of repentance and sayth, seeing we are but regenerate in part, and daily sinne. The primitive churches I hope you will graunt were regenerate in their communion (I use your termes) & yet to them was preached repentance. Ergo your reason fayles you.

* *Mat. 8. 12.*
† *Rev. 2. 16, 21.*
3. 3. 20.

3. The members of al true churches whether under the old or new Testament are holy, in regard of Gods covenant, and so wee are to walke towards them: but that every particular person is truly regenerate, is not our faith, because in visible Churches there may be hypocrites, & man

† *Iob. 2. 1.*

oft sayleth on his part* and breaketh of. Notwithstanding, ſcharitie bindes vs to hope the beſt, until the contrarie appeare.

Co. 13. Laſtly where you ſay. That the Iewes were not ſaythful in their cõmunie becauſe Iohn ſaith *the Lord will purge his ſtorre*; & Chriſt ſayth, *they are of your father the Diuill*.

1. This may fall out to any true Church to haue unſaythfull members that may pollute their cõmunie, ſee the Churches of Aſia, Rev. 2. 4. 5. 14. 15. 20. 21. & 3. 1. 2. 16. & of Galatia. Gal. 3. 1. but what is this to the purpoſe that the Iewes became unſaythful? (but by the way remeber that they ought to haue bene ſaythful, which you deny to that Church) did not Gods covenant ſtand ſtill in force to the ſaythful and their ſeed? Rom. 9. 6. 8. 15. & 11. 1. 2--5.

2. Chriſt ſpeaketh to ſuch of the Iewes as by their works did ſhew themſelves to be of the Diuill, he intendeth not to teach, that this was the conſtitution & ſtate of the whol Church under the old Teſtament: as much as Chriſt ſayd to theſe Iewes may be ſayd to us under the Goſpel, as of thoſe Antichriſtians, whereof Iohn ſpeaketh: 1. Iohn 2. 19. and therefore all that you have ſayd, proves nothing for the queſtion in hand.

Againe to prove the Diſciples to be baptiſed, you cite Ioh. 4. 1. & 1. 35. 40. I anſwere, in the latter place is no mention of baptiſme and in the former, it is ſayd *that Ieſus baptiſed moe diſciples then Iohn*, which in verſe, 2. is explained, that he *did not baptiſe, but his diſciples*, ſhewing that Chriſt baptiſed diſciples by the hands of his diſciples: So I think they were baptiſed of Iohn as Chriſt was, but I wil not contend there about. And for that you anſwer concerning the Eunuch, *that ſome mention ſhould haue bene made either of Philip or of the Eunuch touching his children*.

It is nothing that you ſay, for what occaſion was there to ſpeak of his children? And it is for you to prove that the Eunuch had children, ſeing he was one (as it is like) that was made chaff by man: Mat. 19. 12. & the rather becauſe in regard of his honour and authoritie he was called *Cheiffe gouernour* as alſo in reſpect of his country, an *Ethiopian*: Act. 8. 27. ſee Eſa. 56. 3. 4. 5. Now to your ſecond reaſon.

The 2. reaſon againſt baptiſing of infants answered.

R. Clifton.

But having thus diſcovered the weaknes of this firſt reaſon let vs come to the next which is this:

Beauſe

Reason, 2.

Because Christ commaundeth to make Disciples by teaching them and then to baptise them. Mat. 28. 19. Joh. 4. 1. But infants can not by doctrine become Christs disciples, and so can not by the rule of Christ be baptised.

Answer.

1 The Apostles were indede commanded to make Disciples and to call vnto the faith and felowship of the Gospel not onely the Iewes, but the Gentiles throughout the world and gaye them power to preach the Gospel, which before had bene preached to Abraham: Gal. 3. 8. And to baptise all that did receive it. And this we grant that sayth must go before baptisme, in al such as are to be made Disciples and brought into the covenant of God. So went sayth before circumcision: Abraham first beleewed & after was circumcised. And likewise must al they which with Abraham enter into Gods covenant, first beleewe and then be baptised, as the Eunuch, A& 8. 37. Lydia A& 16. 15. & the Keeper of the prison, verse. 33. but when such have receved the sayth, then are their infants and household capable also of baptisme, as Abrahams family was of circumcision, he beleewed the promises Gen. 17. & therefore it is written that when God opened the hart of Lidia that shee did attend to the word that Paule preached and beleved, not onely she herselfe, but all her household were baptised, and yet is there no mentiō of the sayth of any of them, save of Lidas onely. And so the Keeper beleewing, all that appertayned vnto him were baptised: And this is proportionable to the example of Abraham, whose sayth we find sufficient to interest all his in the covenant, and make them capable of the seale.

2. Christ taketh the same course in giving out his commission to his Disciples, Mat. 28. 19. to bringe the Gentiles into Gods covenant;

covenant, that the Lord tooke with Abraham for making his covenant with him that he should be the father of many nations &c. he did not first command him to be circumcised; but preached to him the Gospel or covenant, and he beleeving was circumcised and his household: So here is a commandement, first for the publishing of the Gospel to them that were not in Christ: and for baptising such as beleeved with their families (for it is included in this commandement, els had not the Apostle baptised the families of Lidia and of the Keper, as before is observed.) And it is well to be minded that there is no mention made of the faith of any in the familie of Lidia, save of Lidiass onely, for it is not sayd all in the house that beleeved were baptised, which had bene necessary if this commandement of Christ should be expounded after the mind of the Anabaptists.

3. If children shalbe excluded from baptisme because they can not be made Disciples by teaching and so beleeve, then by a good reason may they be excluded fro salvation, for he that sayth *he that beleeveth and is baptised shalbe saved*, sayth also, *he that beleeveth not, shalbe damned Mar. 16. 16.* if therfore want of sayth be sufficient to exclude infants from baptisme, then likewise the want of faith is sufficient to exclude them from salvation. If the former be held to be the meaning of Christ, then must also the latter be graunted, a thought whereof is to be abhord.

Lastly, generall rules must be taken with their sense and meaning. It is a generall rule given by the Apostle. 2 Thes. 3. 10. *that if any would not work, he should not eate.* Yet if any should gather fro hence, that the impotent & infants should not eat, because they do not work, this were to offer violence, & to wrest the Apostles doctrine: So Christ giving a general rule for the making of Disciples and baptising them: now to deprive the infants of beleeving parents of baptisme, because they cannot receive instruction (which is intended onely of them that are capable thereof) is to diminish the commandement of Christ: alike as he that should say, *infants*

can not beleve, and therefore cannot be saved on Against it can never be the true meaning of a Scripture, when it is so expounded, that the exposition contradicth other Scriptures, or any sound conclusio gathered out of the Scriptures as this exposition of the Anabaptists doth upon this place of Mat. 28: 19, as my former reasons for the baptizing of infants, do playely manifest

Mr Smyth.

Next followeth your answer to my 2. Reason, which reason of mine is framed thus: They that can not by teaching be made Christs disciples ought not to be baptized. Infants by teaching can not be made disciples: Ergo, &c.

Your answer to this Argument of myne, consisteth in 4. particulars. &c. to the first particular of your answer, I say that you erre mistaking the Scripture for Abrahams faith did not go before his circumcision as a necessarie antecedent to establish him a member of the Church of the old Testament but as a necessary president, example type or pattern of iustification. And circumcision in Abraham was not a seal of his iustification or of the everlasting covenant of God &c.

R. Clifton

I answer 1. to the former proposition of your argument that it is false, for infants of beleevors may and ought to be baptized, though they can not by teaching be made disciples. 2. to that you answer to my first particular, thus I reply; That of Abraham & his circumcision, & of the Church of the old Testament I have spoken before: this now I wil adde further, that Abraham was an idolater when the Lord took him from beyond the flood and brought him into the Land of Canaan, and that it was the great mercy of God that made him a member of the Church. As for his faith it was not opely a president or example to others, but was also necessarie for him self, as the Scripture teacheth, he beleved the Lord and it was imputed unto him for righteousness. And being thus iustified, he afterward received circumcision, as a seal of the righteousness of faith, by which he and his seed had sealed unto them this solemne covenant of the Lord, to become his peculiar people and to haue him to be their God, which at that time the Lord made with him, & so became the members of the Church of the new Testament

Qz

being

being rightly understood.

And where you say, *that Circumcision was not a seal of Abrahams justification*, &c. you give the holy Ghost the lye, which testifieth the contrary, Rom. 4. 11. As for your reason, that he was sealed by the Spirit long before, it is nothing to the purpose; for the Spirit was no external seal, as circumcision was. The Spirit sealeth inwardly, and is proper onely to the elect; yea to all Gods people in Babilon, and so is no visible signe of Gods promises given to the Church visible, whereof our dispute is.

And here remember by the way, that Abraham before he was circumcised had the seal of the Spirit, and so was under the new Testament, as also others had. Ela. 63. 11. Pla. 51. 11. Hebr. 11. 4. 39. that being the pledge and earliest of the sowles of al the faythfull in al ages of the love of God in Christ.

But Abrahams justification as uncircumcision was a type of the justification of the Gentiles who are uncircumcised. And Abrahams circumcision after his justification sealed him up to be the father of all the believers circumcised.

That Abrahams justification was an example to al that should be justified both of the Jewes and Gentiles, I graunt, viz. that as he was justified by fayth so should al others that beleve be likewise justified. But as concerning Abrahams circumcision, that it should seal him up to be the father of al belevers circumcised: the Apostle sayth thus. * *Abraham received the signe of circumcision, the seal of the righteousness of fayth, which he had when he was uncircumcised &c. that he should be the father of al that beleve not being circumcised &c. and the father of circumcision &c.* In which words I observe, 1. that circumcision was a seal of the righteousness of fayth, yea of Abrahams. 2. that Abraham was made the father of the uncircumcised beleving. And the father of al the circumcised, his posteritie the Israelites, and so was father of both sorts of people, and of the parents and children. 3. In calling Abraham father of the circumcised and uncircumcised, he meant of his spiritual fatherhood, in regard of the "covenant". 4. He is called the father of circumcision, not onely of belevers circumcised,

(as you say,) but of their infants also; seeing they were circumcised: and in this you deceive your hearers; by perswading them that Abraham was the father onely of belevers circumcised, & not of their seed, whereas Paul sayth, *he was father of the circumcision.*

And

the baptising of infants assured.

And so circumcision had a triple use; one general, two special. 1. Circumcision sealed up Abrahams forme of justification to be a pattern of all the believers in uncircumcision &c. 2. Circumcision sealed up Abrahams forme of justification to be a pattern to all believers in circumcision &c. The general use of Abrahams circumcision was common with him to Ismael, and al the persons of his familie, and al the church of Israelites, viz. to seal him up to the old Testament, and to the observance of the whole law, &c. You labour by your new devised distinctions to obscure the truth, and to shut out of the covenant of grace the infants of the faithfull, otherwise we affirme that both believing Jewes and Gentiles are justified and live by their faith, and that the one and the other have but * one way of justification, as they have but one Christ, and one covenant of salvation. And a circumcision was a seal hereof to Abraham, so was it given to have the same use to all that were circumcised, viz. to seal up unto them the everlasting covenant. And this did circumcision even to their infants whom weade to account as the justified of God by "his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Iesus."

Concerning that general use of circumcision (as you terme it) to be common with Abraham and to Ismael, and to al the persons of his familie, &c. is true, but the use viz. to seal him up to the old Testament, and to the observance of the whole law &c. you must prove, (for God had not then given the law or old Testament) It was the covenant in Christ that was sealed by circumcision, and not the law or covenant of works. And whereas it was the Apostles purpose to shew that † Abraham was not justified by works, he hath not proved it, but confirmed it by this your distinction of circumcision, if Abraham received it to seal him up to the old Testament, & to the observance of the law.

Now for the place of Rom. 4. 11. Which I am assured you wil ground your assertion upon, I say it is both falsly translated & expounded: for (tes en acrobustia) is usually translated, Which Abraham had when he was uncircumcised, and this I say is a false translation: for this is the true translation, viz. Which (is or was or shal be) in the uncircumcision, meaning that circumcision upon Abraham, &c. Was a seal of justification to al the uncircumcision that beleeve, and the end of his circumcision is the fatherhood of the faithfull.

Here you pick a quarrel against the translation before it was alleadged, and so it pleaseth you to set downe an other with your own exposition, to this

† Hab. 2.

Gal. 2. 20.

* Rom. 1.

† 3. 24.

† Rom. 5.

† Rom. 4.

&c.

this scripture. Rom. 4. 1. and by your gloss corrupt the text. *You*
 fault the Translator for saying *(which he had &c.)* and you put in *(which*
or was or shd be.) The text is *(which in the uncircumcision)*, the verbe being o-
 mitted. Now I ask you what warrant you have more for your addition then
 the Translator had for his? the scope of the Apostles words makes it plain,
 that the Translator saw his meaning better then you do. For Paul speak-
 eth of Abrahams justification by fayth. Rom. 4. 3. - 11. asketh how fayth
 was imputed unto him, *when he was circumcised or uncircumcised* ver. 10. an-
 swereth, *when he was uncircumcised.* Then preventing a double objection
 that might be made thus. 1. If Abraham received the righteousness of
 fayth when he was uncircumcised, then his example seemes to belong to
 them that are uncircumcised. No (sayth the Apostle) for he received cir-
 cumcision in way, seeing he had received the righteousness of fayth before
 no (sayth Paul) for he received it as a seal for the confirmation of his fayth
 which he had in his uncircumcision. Then he expresseth the cause both
 of Abrahams justification by fayth, when he was uncircumcised, and also
 that being justified by fayth he received circumcision, viz. *that he might be*
the father of al that beleve being uncircumcised, that righteousness might be imputed
unto them also, And the father of circumcision, not unto them onely which are of
the circumcision, but also unto them that walk in the steps of the fayth of our father
Abraham &c. this is the Apostles meaning.

Now whereas you affirme, *that circumcision upon Abraham was a seal of*
justification to al the uncircumcised that beleve, I desire this may be proved ac-
 cording as you mean. For the Apostle sayth it not; but thus, *he received*
the signe of circumcision the seal of the righteousness of the fayth which he had: for
 how could Abrahams circumcision that was applied to his particular per-
 son seal up justification to us & not to himselfe seeing a seal is a particular
 applying of the covenant to the partie that is partaker thereof. By this
 your exposition, you make Abrahams circumcision to differ from the cir-
 cumcision of his seed, of which difference, the Lord spake not a word in the
 institution thereof, nor in any other place. Yet you say, *the righteousness*
of fayth is not sealed up to Abrahams particular person, but to the uncircumcised
that beleve. Which doctrine is very strange, that Abrahams circumcisi-
 on shal seal that to others & those uncircumcised, & not to himselfe being
 circumcised; you must therefore bring better prooffe hereof, als ye intend

the baptizing of infants answered.

129

silent affirmation will be accepted as the facing out of an error. As for the common acceptatio & translation of Rom. 4. 11. which you say is the mother of this heresy, it is confirmed in these words: *but unto them also that walk in the steps of the faith of our father Abraham when he was uncircumcised*; which makes it plaine, that the Apostle understood by the righteousness of faith, Abrahams righteousness which he by faith apprehended, and which was sealed up unto him by circumcision.

Againe, al the persons of Abrahams familie were not circumcised, because of Abrahams sayth, but the males onely, the males being assumed as types for to teach them figuratively the male Christ.

So many of Abrahams familie were circumcised as the Lord commanded: to the women it was not injoynd, and though Christ was typed out in the circumcision of the male, yet as it was a sacrament, it sealed unto them the righteousness of sayth, and therefore in Genes. 17. 10. it is called the covenant, because it was a signe thereof, sealing unto them remission of sinns and regeneration by sayth in Christ to come.

And the females were uncircumcised &c. so signifie that those that had not the male Christ in them, were not fit to be members of the Church of the new Testament.

1. The females were not accounted as uncircumcised, seeing they were comprehended under the males, and so distinguished from the uncircumcised Gentiles Genes. 34. 14. Deut. 7. 3. Eia. 3. 16. 2. I confesse that such as are not in Christ, are no fit members of the church, but this seemes not the reason why women were not partakers of this sacrament, but rather to teach that salvation should come by the male: but this allegorising proves nothing.

Further you say, as it was with Abraham and his familie in Circumcision, so was it with Lidia &c. it is not so; I shew the difference in divers particulars. 1. They of Abrahams familie were circumcised upon particular precept, &c. 2. They that were males onely were circumcised &c. 3. They that were circumcised of Abrahams familie were at the males being of years though never so lewd &c. 4. As Lidia did not receive the strength to circumcision, and as she did not receive the male of circumcision, so she had not the female baptism in the familie of the Gaylon and of Lidia, &c.

To these pretended differences I answer, 1. that the precept of sealing the covenant to Abraham is not repealed, (only the ceremonie is changed)

2. that the male baptism is not repealed, but is still in use.

ged) and that Christ hath given * a comāndement for the administering of the signe as the preaching of the covenant to all nations, and by vertue hereof were the families of the Gaylor and Lydia baptised, and so it was with Lydia and her family, as it was with Abraham and his household, as was sh: not the daughter of Abra. entring into Gods covenant, she & hers, as Abraham and his entred in, & seeing the holy Ghost saith that the householdes were baptised without limitation, it belongs to you to prove, that the children in these families were exempted, or els that children are not of the family, or els we may not restreine the Apostles words contrary to the tenure of the first giving of the covenant which was sealed to yonge and old. For your first difference, I deny that comāndement to be a particular precept to Abraham and his house alone, it was also to all beleevers of the Gentiles and their children, and so was it a generall precept to the whole Church for the sealing of the covenant, (though circumcision was proper to the former Church, as baptism is to the church of the new testament) and so there needed no particular precept for baptising of infants, they being cōprehended under the general. For the 2. difference, that the *females onely were to be circumcised*. I answer, this was according to the Lords dispensation, then to set his signe on the males, now on both sexes, but neither then nor now to restraine it from infants. Concerning your 3. difference, I ask you, where the scripture sayth that any wicked persons were circumcised in Abrahams familie? Dare you condemn that house which the Lord doth iustifie? see Gen. 18. 19. where the Lord saith, *I know that he wil command his sonnes and his household after him that they keep the way of the Lord, &c.* and that infants being males, in Abrahams house were circumcised you can not deny, for the comāndement is that every man child be circumcised, and Abraham did so, Gen. 17. 12. 13. And therefore you must prove that the children in Lydiaes & the Gaylors families were not baptised, els you shew no difference. For your 4. difference, it stands upon an unequal comparison, & toucheth not the thing in question, you might know that faith, could not intitle the females to circumcision, when they had no comāndement for it. In the Gaylors & Lydiaes families the women were capable of the seal by the ordinance of Gods. Again, concerning the males, infidelitie might and did hinder from circumcision, as it did the Gentiles which received not the faith: and so infidelitie excludes from baptism both males & females. As for infants they can not be sayd to be infidels or vnbeleevers for they are partakers of the pro-

life, which is the ground of faith, els * were they under condemnation.

To the second particular of my answer, you reply thus.

I answer, that, in this particular there are differences betwixt the one act of Abraham, and the other of Lydia and the Gaylor according to the commission of Christ, Mar. 28. 19. 1. Abraham and all his family by the Lords commandment came under the covenant of the old Testament actually, & the males onely were circumcised: but Christ doth not command all persons of a family in the new testament to be baptised, but onely such as are made disciples. 2. the Gospel was onely preached to Abrahams owne person, but in the Gaylors case Paul preached to all that were in his house, &c. 3. The gospel was not preached to Abraham thereby to prepare him to circumcision, as if thereby it should follow, that, circumcision was a seal of the Gospel, for it is not so, &c. but Christ in the new testament commandeth the gospel to be preached to every particular person, that is to be admitted into the Church by baptisme, and so Paul did to the Gaylors family.

To your first difference I answer as formerly I have done, that Abraham and his family came not under the old testament or covenant of works, seeing it was not made with him but with Israel afterward by the Ministry of Moses. 2. Your comparison should thus be propounded: as Abraham & all his family, came under the covenant of God: so likewise do the faithful of the Gentiles and their families: & therefore as Abraham and his family were circumcised: so ought the faithful and their families to be baptised, thus holds the comparison, and thus it is against you: and you do but beg the question, in saying, that Christ commands not all the persons of a family in the new Testament to be baptised: for this is defended against you; that Christs commandment of baptizing, extends to the infants of the beleivers as well as to themselves.

To your 2. difference I answer, that the Gospel which was by the Lord preached to Abraham, was by him preached to his family, To your third difference I answer, that the gospel was preached to Abr: to be the meanes and ground of his faith, & circumcision was given to him to be a seal of the righteousness of faith, & therefore a seal of the Gospel which was preached unto him, and so the Gospel was preached to Lydia & the Gaylor, & baptisme given for the same use as circumcision was to Abraham. And where you say, Christ commandeth the gospel to be preached to every particular person that is to be admitted into the Church by baptisme, and so Paul did to the Gaylors family. Why sayd you not (according to the point in hand) And so Paul did to Lydias familie, & the Gaylors? Did your self perceive that you could not see it so in Lydias familie? Did you therefore passe by that exaple? Act. 16. 14. 15. Let the reader wel observe these things and this dealing of yours.

1 Gen 17.
19. & 22.
1--5. Gal.
8.

And to this your standing so strictly, that the gospel in covenant was preached every creature. I answer, that as it was preached to such as were received into the Christian Church so was it to Abraham & all the Gentiles, which entered into the old Church: and therefore in this is no difference.

To my 3. exception thus you answer: *Christ speaks onely of such as to whom the gospel may be preached that are of a docible age and nature.*

I graunt that Christ intendeth by his commandment that they should be taught, that are of a docible age; but with all intendeth it so to be preached to them, as it was before to Abraham, which was not to exclude their infants from the covenant or seale thereof. To this objection, how infants not being in the covenant can be saved, you answer: *Either they are all saved though they can not come to faith by hearing, or that they are one of the Lords secrets.*

Can you speak of faith, to say they are all saved and not within the covenant of grace? but it is not your faith, for you hold it doubtingly, and being driven to a non plus, you answer as the Priests and Elders did to Christ concerning Johns baptisme; who sayd, we can not tell whether it be from heaven or of men: and so you make the state of children, one of Gods secrets, but the contrarie I have before proved. And here you might see (if your erroneous opinion had not blynded your eyes,) that you cannot believe that any infants shalbe saved, seing by your doctrine you have no word to ground your faith upon for their salvation.

To the last particular of my answer, you reply, saying:

First, you confesse that this place of Mat. 28. 19. is not uttered of Christ in respect of infants that they should be taught, and then I say, he never intended by this place that they should be baptised, &c.

I will confesse as much as I haue spoken: In this scripture: Mat. 28. 19. Christ commaunded to make disciples and to baptise them; the former I sayd, Christ intended to such as were unconverted, but yet so, as they receiving the gospel, their infants came also under the covenant: the latter, I did, and stil do affirme to be understood of the beleevvers and their seed, and so I have not contradicted my self; as you untruly speak.

Next I say, that general rules shalbe expounded with their senses, and as temporal persons & infants shal eat, though they can not work: so infants shal be saved, though they cannot be baptised, seing they cannot by teaching be made Disciples &c.

Now you affirme infants shalbe saved, a little before you doubted whe-

the baptizing of infants, answered.

113

it were not a secret, thus visible men are when they erre from the truth. But infants can be saved ~~as now~~ you affirme, then tell me whether you hold them to be saved in the covenant or out of the covenant? if within, you crosse your self, and if without, shew me what warrant out of the word you have so to beleever? certainly * there is no salvation out of Christ. And if children can be saved by the covenant, why is the figure thereof denied them? You separate those things that Christ hath joyned together, (and yet you charge me therewith) and so you pronounce a curse to your self in saying, *we be so them that so do without repentance, being you deny baptism to infants, that are the children of the covenant which joyneth the parents and the children together.*

Your conclusion of this argument, is shut up with some bitter and reproachful speeches: saying: *You blaspheme the truth with your tale of Anabaptistry. You are driven to most miserable shifts for your Pedobaptistry, which you will not stand without scraping together all the vestings and perversings of the Scripture.*

These speeches and divers others of like sort, which you use in your writings, take and apply to your self, for the maineyning of your heresy against Pedobaptistrie; also they serve to relive the corruption of your hart, and therefore I will answer them with silence, praying the Lord to give you a sight of his truth and a better hart.

The 3. Reason against baptizing of infants, answered.

R. Clifton

Now follows the 3. reason.

3. Reason.

Because if infants be baptised, the carnal seed is baptised and so the seed of the covenant is administered to them unto whom the covenant appertyneth not. Rom. 9. 8. which is a profanation.

Ans

Answer

Answer.

1. This reason seemeth to imply, that the seed of the faithful is part carnal and part spiritual, (for I can not imagine that the author holdethal the seed of the faithful to be carnal, and that the covenant appertaines not to any of them, seing so to affirme contradictions, Act. 2. 39.) And therefore because the spiritual seed is not discerned until it manifest it selfe by outward profession, therefore may not be baptised, least in baptising them, the seale should be set also vpon the carnal seed unto whom belongs not the covenant. To affirme this, first is to deny that which is done to the seed to whom the promise belongs for the wicked sake, & so to iniure them. 2. this reason also serveth as well against the circūcisiō of the infants of the Israelites; seing at 8. dayes of age, they could not be discerned, whether they were of the carnal or spiritual seed, & so the seale of the covenant be administred to them to who the covenant did not belong: But as then the not discerning hereof, did nothing hinder circūcision to be administred to all the infants of the Israelites; no more now, can the not knowing of the spiritual seed from the carnal, hinder baptisme.

2. Touching the seed of the faithful thus I conceive thereof, that it is carnal and spiritual in divers respects; carnal, as they naturally descend of their parents: so are they all alike borne in sin Psa. 51. 5. Spiritual, in respect of the covenant wherein they are comprehended with their parents, Gen. 17. 7. Act. 2. 39. in which regard also, al the children of the faithful, are sayd to be holy, 1. Cor. 7. 14. And thus considered, I deny the children of the faithful to be carnal seed, & do affirme that to such belongs the covenant and the seale thereof, Act. 2. 39. And though some of them in the sight of God be knowne for none of his, yet to vs it sufficeth for the administration of baptisme, that they be the seed of the faithful. And therefore as the Israelites circūcised al there children (though some of them proved to be carnal afterward, as Ismael, Esau &c.) so are we to baptise al our infants leaving the

secret things to God. Deut. 29. 29.

3. If this be sufficient to cleare us from the profaning of the sacrament if we baptise them that make confession of their sayth, because they so do, though they be not the children of God: as S. Magus. Act. 8. 13. then is it not simply a profaning of baptisme to administer it to thē to whō belongs not the covenant, but to do it to them which playnely appeare to vs to be without. Therefore if no man dare take vpon him to say this or that infant is carnall and without the covenant of grace, it shalbe no profanation of the sacramēt, if it be administred vnto such, seing we ought to hold the seed of the faithfull, holy. 1. Cor. 7. 14. If it be objected (as some have done to me) that all the seed of the faithful are carnal and so to be held until they beleeeve and make confession of their sayth. I Answer, 1. If they take carnal, as it is opposed to the children of the promise: Rom. 9. 8. 13. these two seeds are made so opposit by the Apostle as that the one can never be the other. 2. If by carnal they meane nothing els but that natural corruption wherein we are borne, that hinders infants no more frō baptisme, then it doth those that can give an account of their sayth: seing natural corruption remayneth stil in the purest professor. Rom. 7. 23.

And if it be replyed, that their natural corruption is not imputed to them that beleeeve: no more (say I) is it to infants, els Christ dyed not for thē, neyther could they be saved dying whyt they be yong.

Lastly, if Abraham knowing that God would establish his covenant to Isaac, Gen 17. 19. yet circumcised Ismael vers. 25. and Isaac knowing that God had chosen his yonger son, Gen. 25. 23. with 27. 33. yet circumcised Esau aswel as Iacob, and in so doing neither of them prophaned the sacrament: muchles is baptisme prophaned when it is administred to the seed of the faithful to whom belongeth the promise. Act. 2. 39. and thus having shewed the weaknes of your reasons against baptising of infants, let us come to the 2. position.

M. Smyth.

In the next place followeth your answer to my third Argument, which may be

The carnal seed is not to be baptised: for the covenant pertaineth not to them.

Infants are the carnal seed. Rom. 9. 8.

Ergo Infants are not to be

baptised.

To this Argument you make answer in 4. particulars, 1, You expound my mea-

ning, but I can expound myne owne words best, and therefore by the carnal seed I

understand children borne by carnal generation what soever though they afterward

come for to believe, for they are carnal visible to me; whosoever they be that do not show they

faith by their workes, that do not the workes of Abraham. Rom. 7. 2. 1 Cor. 3. 4.

2. Rom. 9. 8. & 4. 23. Heb. 7. 16.

R. Clyfton.

In the last part of your reply to my answer to your former reason, you

sayd, that infants shal be saved, and now they are al carnal visibly unto you:

can you say that they that are carnal to you, shal be saved? If the word teach

you that they are carnal, how can you call them spiritual? Your

reason seemes to be grounded upon Iam. 2. 18. Iohn. 8. 39. in both

which scriptures, application is made to them that are of yeares and

capable of instruction, and you applying them to infantes do per-

vert the meaning thereof and purpose of the holy Ghost, who intend-

eth to discover the hypocrisie of vaine professors, and to shew who are true

sonnes of God, viz. such as by a godly conversation declare their faith to

be unfeigned. I denye that infantes are carnal, because they shew not their

faith by their workes. Those whom the scripture so calleth, are they that

walk after the flesh and do the deeds thereof, which Infants neither do,

nor can do, wanting actual power of doing good or evil.

The former scripture that you alledge to prove infantes carnal is Rom.

7. 14. The Apostle sayth of himself, I am carnall, and so you conclude

thence that al that naturally descended of Abraham, and so of the Faithfull

are carnal, and so to be reputed of us, and consequently without the cove-

nant: Paul when he thus sayd of himself, I am carnal, was regenerate. And

the baptizing of infants, answered.

And if you call children carnal, in that sense, it hinders not but they may be spiritual seed as he was. The Apostle calls himself carnal, in respect of his natural corruption and carnal infirmities wherewith he was compassed: neither was he wholly carnal, but in part † spiritual. And here is to be noted that carnal, is opposed to spiritual, in one and the same person, and is found to be in al that profess faith and are regenerate, & yet doth not debarre them eyther of the covenant or of baptism.

A like Answer may be given concerning, 1 Cor. 3. 1. 2. The Corinthians are called carnal, because of their infirmities and carnal works, as en-
tying, strife &c. vers. 3. &c. Infants cannot in this sense be called carnal, & therefore this scripture also is unjustly applyed unto them. And here it is to be noted, that a people which were a true church and within the covenant and baptised, are called carnal, whereby we may see how impertinently this scripture is alleaged.

You say also, that you call children carnal as in opposition to the spiritual seed, that is seed of Abraham. Gal. 3. 16.

I have sayd that carnal, as the Apostle opposeth yt to spiritual, is our corrupt nature that * lusteth against the spirit, and is found in the faythfull. Now to oppose the infants of believers to spiritual seed is no opposition: for such infants in regard of the covenant are spiritual, though by nature they are carnal.

Concerning, Rom. 9. 8. see page 63. The Apostle proving God to be faithful, sheweth withal, that though the promise was made indefinitely to al the Israelites, yet al that were carnally begotten of Israel, were not true Israelites, save onely such as were the children of the promise, vers. 7. 9. but he intendeth not to oppose all the seed of Abraham naturally begotten, to the childre of the promise; for then should Isaac be opposed against himself, for he was both the natural seed of Abraham, and a child of the promise: but this he teacheth, that although many be reputed the sons of God in regard of the promise which is made indefinitely to all the seed of Abraham, and to al that are called to be members of the visible church, yet al of those in the account of God, are not children of the promise, seeing many hypocrites are found to be in the outward visibilitie of the Church, to whom the Lord shall say, * I know you not whence ye are, &c.

Touching Gal. 4. 23. it hath been handled before pag. 14. Thus I will here answer to your objection out of it. viz. that Paul doth not in-

tend to make an opposition betwene the natural seed of Abraham and the heires of promise: but opposeth against the false doctrine of such as w^{ill} have circumcision and the workes of the law to be necessary to iustification. After divers reasons against this error, he illustrateth his purpose by an allegorie which shadoweth forth two. sorts of children borne of two Testaments as Ismael & Isaac were of two mothers, the one sort that should seek after righteousnes by the law, but they were no better then Ismael, no heires of the promise, but in bondage vnder the law: The other, should seek after righteousnes by Christ, and these are of the covenant of grace; as Isaac was of the freewoman, which are heires and free indeed, and this appeares to be the Apostles meaning by that, which followes in the Allegory; as also by vers. 21. And so it is to be noted, that to be borne after the flesh, (tyed out by Ismael,) is to be without the covenant under the bondage of the law which was given in Sinai, signifying that all such as seek for iustification by the law, are as they that take up their habitation in the wilderness, and never enter into the land of promise.

The next Scripture, is Heb. 7. 16. where the *commandement* is called carnall, so children borne of their parents (say you) naturally are carnall, &c. In this place expounded pag. 68. by carnall commandement the Apostle means that law that commaunded the ordinatioⁿ of the Preists under the old testament which stood in fraile and transitorie things, as in Aarons consecration, &c. Also this commandement or ordination of the Leviticall Preists may be called carnall compared with the ordination of Christ (which was without all *external ceremonies) and not simply: for in other respects it may be counted spiritual as all Gods ordinances are, whether under the old or new testament, and so this scripture rightly understood, maketh nothing to your purpose. And touching childre you should observe, that as it is true, that naturally children are carnall: so is it true also, that the children of the faithful borne under the covenannt, are by grace, spirituall, Gen. 17. 7. 1 Cor. 7. 14.

The covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ did not actually seale upon any infant of the Jewes in deed and in truth, and the place, Act. 2. 39. doth not prove that it did; for the place is to be understood of the offer of Christ and the new testament to all the carnall Jewes, and their children, &c. and therefore I say, to baptise infants, is to baptise the carnall seed.

For this point, & for the exposition of this scriptur, see p. 19. where also is answer to that which is here objected, for by this scripture it is plain that

The baptizing of infants, answered.

139

the promise apperteyned to the Jewes & their infants into which they & their childrē had entred when God made his covenant with Abra: & his seed for the were they in his loynes. And upō this ground the Apostle exhorts the to be baptised: not saying, the promise is now offred, but thus, *the promise is to you*, that is, made or given to you and your children, (as the Apostle playneth the same, Gal. 3. 16. 17. 18. & Act. 26. 6.) *And to as many as the Lord God should call;* meaning to the Gsntiles which should beleve and to their seed.

Therefore, I say, to baptise infants is to baptise the carnal seed, &c. To this I have answered, that childrē of belevers, though carnal by nature, yet are they spirituall in regard of the covenant, and in this respect to hold them the children of Abraham, though they can not shew forth the frutes of faith, which are required of the elder sort.

Why then, they are damned wil you say? God forbid, do you condemn all the men that are not of our faith: and yet they are neerer to condemnation in the iudgement of the scripture to you then infants: for Christ sayth, he that beleeveth not shall be condemned, &c.

It is wel that you detest the condēnatio of infants: & if they be not condēned then are they saved, & if they saved, then are they under the covenant of grace in Iesus Christ. Towching others of yerēs, according as the scripture sheweth their estate to be unto vs, so must we judge, but secret things belong not unto us, the salvation or condemnation of this or that particular person is a secret, nay wee are not able certainly to determine there of amongst such as be external members of the Church, because many that have not on their *marriage garment, may thrust in with the guests, & the flive foolish virgins had lampes as wel as the wise. But this is not the question, we reason concerning the dispensation of Gods covenant in respect of us, which we affirme according to the scripture to be given to the children as wel as to the parents: And you deny it; and therefore by your opinion in respect of us no hope can indeed be had of the salvation of any infant: nay the infants of Turks and infidels wil be in as good estate as the children of belevers: for if infants be without the covenant (as you affirm) if we wil speak according to the scripture, we must hold the *without Christ, and aliens from the common wealth of Israel, without hope and without God in the world; and standing & dying in this estate, to be as Turks & infidels dying in the state of condemnation.

But you not able to shift of this Arg. & loth to confesse the truth, do say,

S a

that

*Mat

11-12

†Mat

1. &c.

*Gen

Ab. 2

*Eph

that the Scripture teacheth nothing concerning their final estate, except it be the salvation of them all.

If it teach the salvation of them all, then I hope it teacheth that they are in Christ; and within the covenant. Christ teacheth that the kingdom of heaven is of such. The final estate of many professors of the sayth being of yeares, is a secret to us, the Scripture doth not open unto us the particular election of this or that man, but teacheth with whom God hath made his covenant, to esteeme them as of his covenant, untill the contrarie appear by their falling away. Rom. 11. 20. And thus having explyained your own meaning of your former Argument, you proceed to examine my Answer, saying.

Now according to your exposition I should intend, because it is not discerned which children are the spiritual seed, which the carnal, therefore both of them must be deprived of baptisme, least by giving baptisme (which you falsely call a seal) to all, it should be profaned to the carnal seed. Well suppose this were my meaning, what then?

If this were your meaning, then my collection must follow: for my calling baptisme a seal, I have proved that which I affirme of baptisme, p. 37. 38.

You except against this exposition two things, one that the spiritual seed should be injured by denying baptisme unto it, for the carnal seeds sake. And I reply by giving baptisme to all indifferently we should injure baptisme, it is to be administered only upon them that confesse their sayth and finnes and are made disciples &c.

Your Answer stands in begging the question, I say it is no more an injury to baptisme to be indifferently administered to all them to whom the covenant is indefinitely given, as it is to the seed of the saythfull; then it was before for circumcision, or is now, when hypocrites are baptised. For we can not be sayd to profane the sacrament by administering it to them that appear to us to be within the Lords covenant, as both hypocrites & infants, untill they break off.

Another thing you except is, that this reason should avayle against circumcision, seeing the males of eight dayes old could not be discerned to be the spiritual seed. And I insist that it was not then needfull, that then they should be discerned to be the spiritual seed; for that carnal seal of that carnal covenant; it was enough for investing of them with that carnal and typical seal that they were the carnal & typical seed, and that they were Israelites or profelyts &c.

Your answer stands upon a false ground, confuted before, I have proved pag. 12. 13. that circumcision is a holy seal of the covenant in Christ, and that your carnal covenant is a devile of your owne. And what

all the Israelites the carnall and typical seed, I have answered and do again say, that though they may be called carnal in respect of their natural generation, or in regard of the infirmities hanging upon them, or some of them termed carnal in respect of their evil works; yet the bodie of the Israelites considered as they were a body and children of the covenant, were a spiritual seed and holy: And it was needful that they should be so, els had not the holy things of God belonged unto them, or they pleased God in their standing.

And shew me that the Lord required anything of any person to be circumcised, but to be a male. But on the new Testament it is taught, 1. that Christ the male must be in us, and 2. that there must be circumcision of the heart. & 3. that we must attain so, & learn al that the schoolmaster of the old Testament could teach us, before we can be baptised.

I answer, that the Lord required as much of them that were to be circumcised as of them that are to be baptised, of the infants both of the Jewes and Christians. God requires onely that they be the seed of the faithful: but for such as were of yeares and without the church, as under the Gospel they are to turne from sinne and professe their fayth in Iesus Christ, that require baptisme: so likewise before Christ, was the case of Abraham himself, & such of the Gentiles as would be circumcised, were to renounce their heathenish and idolatrous worship, and to professe the true God of Israel and his religion. In Ester it is sayd many became Jewes, that is, added themselves to the religion of the Jewes, which is to celebrate or confesse the Lord, these were called "profelytes, which signifies a stranger coming and converted to their manner of religion, as the Eunuch & such like. And it is not to be doubted, that the Jewes would ever admit into their communion, and to administer circumcision unto a Gentile, that did not renounce his heathenishnes and professe their fayth: seeing ¶ one law was to them that were borne in the land, and to the stranger that dwelled amongst them, & therefore as much required of them that were to joyne to the Church of the old Testament, as is now of the that will joyne to the Church of the new. And so I have shewed you that more was required of the that were circumcised, then to be a male: for every one must be a professor, or the child of a professor: & so much is required concerning baptisme & no more. And to your particlers, I answer that these things were also required of the Israelites. Concerning the two former, infants both have Ch. & wer &

† Rom. 9.
5. Psal.

16. 21.

* Ezech.
48. Ezech.
17. Ezech.
21. Ezech.
27.
* Ahab.

† Ex. 12.

are circumcised in hart, in that they are partakers of the covenant of grace & we are to hold them partakers of Christs benefits. Mar. 19. 13. 14. For the third point, *that we must learne what the schoolmaster of the old Testament doth teach.* It is for such as are of yeares, and was required of the Israelites, and not of us onely, as the writings of Moses and the Prophets do shew. And where you say, this must be done *of al before they can be baptised,* it is your addition which you can never prove.

Cor. 13.

Heb. 8. 9.

Gal. 3. 23.

Moreover if you by *old Testament*, do mean the writings of Moses & the Prophets then can not we $\dagger$ learne al that they can teach us whilest we live (unlesse you dream of perfection with the Familists) and so by your doctrine shal not be baptised. But if by *old Testament* you mean Moses administration, it is * abrogated; and seeing fayth is come, we are not under that schoolmaster to be taught by such legal types and ceremonies, as were the Iewes. And so your doctrine is false howsoever it be understood.

Mat. 13. 10

And whereas you wonder at me and at your self that we could not see so evident a truth al this tyme: for myne owne part I saw (I thank God) long since, and stil do see your *evident truth*, (as you call it) to be a manifest error. And further I see that God hath given you over to $\dagger$ pervert the right wayes of the Lord, and to be the leader of others into heresie, and so for just cause, known to himself, blynded your eyes, and hardened your hart. This is that great comfortable state that now you stand in; God in his mercy deliver you forth of it.

To the 2. particular of my Answer to your reason, you thus reply.

1. *Your distinction is without warrant, and I deny that Infants of the faythfull are to be considered in these two respects.* And whereas you bring, Gen. 17. 1. & 1 Cor. 7. 14. to prove the latter part of your distinction, I have answered these two places already, (shewing your false exposition of them &c.)

1 Cor. 7. 14

And these two places of scripture I have likewise formerly proved to stand with my exposition, where it wil appear that this is but a calumniatio of yours, and that my exception is not frivolous. For first you wil not deny that the children of the faythfull, are carnall in respect of their naturall berth, & then being proved within the covenant, in that regard they must needs be spiritual, and as the Apostle calleth them *holy.

To the third particular of my Answer you reply saying:

The sacrament of baptisme is prophaned when it is administered upon a wrong sub-

the baptizing of infants answered.

as to give the Lords supper to an infant of two years old, so to baptize an infant a prophanation, &c.

That to baptize an infant is a prophanation of baptism, I deny, and by sundry reasons I have proved the contrarie, shewing that infants are not a wrong subject, but a right subject for baptism. As for the Lords supper, the institution and use of it and the actions & duties required of them, that eat and drink at that table shew it to be otherwise for the not giving of it to infants.

But you say,

As profession of faith shal exclude any man to al the ordinances of the Church, and wit to baptism. So absence of confession of faith shal debarre every one from all the ordinances of the church in communion. And afterward, you say, Although I dare not say this of that infant is not under the election of God, yet I dare say, that never an infant in the earth is actually seized of the new Testament which is onely attained by confession of sinne and of faith, &c. Mar. 1. 13. Ioh. 3. 3. Eph. 3. 17. &c.

To this I have answered before and have shewed that profession of faith is required of such as were never of the church, and that with them, their seed enters in also: but that absence of confession shal debarre every one from the ordinances of the church, can never be proved, seeing there is not a like reason of persons without, and of infants borne in the church. Also, I have shewed that infants are actually seized of the new Testament according to the tenure of the covenant made with Abraham and his seed, I mean so actually seized, as we are to repute them children of the covenant. And here also, I mynd, that al infants to you stand in the state of condemnation this is your Gospel, contrary to Gen: 17. 7. Act. 2. 39. & 3. 25. Gal. 3. 8. Gen. 12. 3. 1 Cor. 7. 14.

Concerning the Scriptures, which you alledge, I answer, first, that all three places are applied to them of yeares. secondly, in Mar. 1. 15. the Evangelist setteth down in breif the summe of Christs doctrine, the unfolding thereof doth reach to the faithful and their seed, as by his own action appeareth. Mat. 19. 13. 13. Mar. 10. 14. In Ioh. 3. 3. Christ speaks of regeneration without which none can enter into the kingdome of God and he speaks to Nicodemus that was a member of the Jewish church, in to which, as also into the visible Churches under the new Testament, many did and may enter into, with outward confession onely, as did Simon Magus, though their hearts be not regenerate. And therefore this scripture speaking of that grace of God which is invisible, is not

Mar.

Iohn. 3.

The third reason again
fully alleadged for this purpose, where we are to judge of members of the church, not as they stand so before God in his secret counsel, but as they externally appear to us within Gods covenant, by their confession, or otherwise.

ph. 3. 17. That of Ephes. 3. 17. is also spoken to them that were of yeares, who being belevers, they & theirs were Christs, of whom is named the whole familie in heaven and in earth. Esa. 3. 14. 15. & of this scripture also is spoken before.

Though infants could hear and beleve, it is nothing to me, except they can save me their faith, I say therefore that all infants are carnal to me. Rom. 9. 8.

Att. 16. If you be not carnal to your self also, it is well. But thus you confesse that you have no word of God that children can be saved. The scripture requires confession, (as I have sayd) of persons growen to yeares which are to enter into the Church, not of their Infants. It was required of the Gaylor himself that he should beleve, and the promise was that if he and all his howse should be saved. And Zacheus receiving Christ, and professing his repentance, Iesus sayd to him, * *this day is salvation come to this house.* Note, he sayth not onely salvation is come to him but to his howse. And he adds a reason thereof, *forasmuch as he is also become the sonne of Abraham.* And therefore as want of confession in Zacheus Familie, in Lidias, Stephanas &c. hindered not salvation to come to their howses, no more shall hinder any other families of the saythful.

Rom. 9. 8. Touching that of Rom. 9. 8. which you alleadge to prove that infants are carnal, I have expounded before pag. 63. & have shewed that it makes not for your purpose. And where you tel me that I sayd, *that every infant of Abraham, and so of the saythful was borne spiritual as well as carnal, and that the Apostle is contrary to my assertion*; Although being well understood it may so be layd, yet this was that I sayd: *that I did thus conceive of the seed of the saythful, that it is carnal and spiritual in divers respects.* And so I say still, neither doth this scripture contradict it: for those that the Apostle calls children of the flesh, he meanes not thereby all the circumcised, but such of them as became carnal by their works, as those in Joh. 8. 44. and such as for their unbelief were rejected and "broken off from the olive tree, until which tyme they are to be held the children of the covenant, so was Iudas accounted of, & by his fellow disciples to be one of them, although God in his secret counsel know them for none of his." And so Paul doth

we deny the natural sonnes of Abraham to be accounted his spiritual seed in respect of Gods covenant; but that of * these so externally esteemed, there were of them carnal sonnes, manifesting themselves in tyme through unbelief to have been in shew that they were not in deed, as John speaketh of the hypocrites of his tyme. And thus these impossible contradictions as you call them, are easily reconciled.

And where I sayd, *that children of the flesh can never be the children of the promise*, in that sense as the Apostle opposeth the one to the other, Rom. 8. 13. You answer, *that all the children of the Jewes were borne according to the flesh, Gal. 4. 23, 24, 25. and so were carnal, and so are the children of the faithful, and yet as many of the Jewes were afterward regenerate; so many of the infants of the faithful may prove children of the promise, but I confesse that Esau can never be Jacob, &c.*

If you will thus understand, being borne according to the flesh, and so being carnal, you speak not to the Apostles meaning. And Abraham Isaac and Jacob & all the faithful are so borne, as you intend, of which point I have spoken before. And I have already answered to *that place of Gal. 4. 23, 25.* that by that allegorie is described two sorts of children, whereof the one seeks by the workes of the law to be justified, the other by the covenant in Christ, seek after salvation through faith in him, typed out by the two mothers and their two sonnes. Now take this scripture in his true sense, and it can not be gathered from hence, that eyther all the children of the Jewes were thus borne after the flesh, and in this sense to be called carnal as the Apostle meaneth, nor yet that the childre of the faithful are thus to be held of us, to be carnal: For they seek not by workes, justification, and therefore makes not themselves children of the bondwoman, I mean of the covenant of workes, or of the law: for this falleth out by an action of the parties themselves, that refuse the doctrine of free justification by faith, and seek salvation by the law. And this is that the Apostle reproves the Galathians for, because after they had begunne in the spirit, they would be made perfect by the flesh.

Carnal corruption doth hinder infants from baptisme, more then men of yeares, because men of yeares make confession of their sinnes and their faith, and so declare their mortification and regeneration; but infants cannot, or do not so much as we, and so with them we have nothing to doe.

But the covenant of God hath to doe with them, and therefore we also,

T

If we

* 1. 1.

41. 11.

† 1. 1.

“ pag. 10

Gal. 4.

24. 25.

† Gal. 3.

if we wil waste according to it. Also your comparifon is not good for infants nede not to make fuch confeffion of their finnes and fayth as men of yeares are to do, feing they are already to vs within the covenant of God.

2. The Scripture gives nether precept nor example to require an aduall confeffion of their fayth of al that are baptifed, except of fuch as are
Cor. 14. of yeares and to be added to the Church: but examples of the contrary.
Act. 16. And therefore to make a general rule of fuch particulars: thereby to conclude the feed of the faithfull, is contrary to the meaning of the Scripture.
31. 33. ture.

But where as I did affirme, *that natural corruption is not imputed to infants no more then to men beleeving,* you answer *that I cannot defend that without the opinion of vniuerfal redemption; And then if all infants of the faithfull being delivered from their natural corruption, may therefore be baptifed, then all infants partakers of the fame benefite fhall be baptifed, even the infants of the Turkes.*

As concerning that opinion of general redemption, I reiect as an error: but as touching the imputing of natural corruption to infants, thus I mean, that as the children of the faithfull are to vs within Gods covenant, as we as their parents, becaufe of the promife made to the faithfull and their feed:
Heb. 10. 17 So of vs they are to be eſtemed of, as pertakers of the promife, whereof the not imputing of finne is one. But whereas you would inferre hereupon that *infants of the Turkes partakers of the fame benefite, may therefore be baptifed as well as the infants of beleevers,* I deny that eyther they are partakers of the fame benyfite (I meane the covenant in Chriſt) or may be baptifed, if their parents come not to the fayth; becaufe they are not viſibly known to vs to be of the covenant, as the infants of the faithfull are. And the Church is not to adminiſter baptifme but to thoſe that are children of the covenant viſibly apparant. As for condemning or not condemning, I leaue to God. That which I ſpeak of, is touching our queſtion about the adminiſtration of baptifme, that it appertaines onely to members of the Church and to ſuch as come out of the world to be ioyned vnto it. And ſeing the infants of vnbeleevers to vs appeere not to be of the kingdome of Chriſt, becaufe their parents remayne ſtil in infidelity, we cannot acknowledge them, nether have we any rule to admit them, vnles ſome beleeuer make them his children by adoption, or the like. And we reſuſe them as not belonging to the viſible communion of the faithfull as yet, and there

The baptizing of infants, answered.

147

without further searching into Gods secreet counsell. And thus I hope the scruple which you say remayneth is removed.

To the 4. particular of my answer, you reply: *That the external state of that external covenant was perticularly injoyed by God, and the knowledge of the reprobation of Esau and Ismael did not hinder it. But now seeing we have an expresse commaundement for baptizing of infants, but &c.*

Circumcision the seale of the covenant of grace was commaunded to every member of the Church, and so is baptisme now as before is proved. *† Gen. 17. 12. Ma.*

Concerning Ismael and Esau, that their parents had knowledge of their reprobation and yet did circumcise them. 1. I do not find that that secreete was reveiled vnto them. *28. 19.*

2. Christ knew that Judas was reprov'd, yet eate he the passeover with him. The administration of the Sacraments is according to menis outward standing, & not according to election: & therefore the parents ought to circumcise them of their houlhold, according as the Lord had commaunded. And as Abraham did know that God would establishe his covenant to Isaac; so he knew also, that it should be in Christ that should dis-

send of Isaacks line and not of Ismaels, in whom not onely Isaac and his posterity, but al the "nations of the earth should be blessed: yea Ismael, if he beleev'd, and so many of his stocke as should beleve. And so the promise concerning Christ to come was to be fulfilled in the seed of Isaac and not of Ismael or Esau. As touching Ismaels & Esaus state, is before spoken of. ** Gal. 3. 10. " Gal. 3. 8.*

And thus much concerning this first Position. For where you say, *we have no expresse commaundement for baptizing of infants*, and al that folowes to the end of this question, is answered before, yet I wil note this here, that you end this point with a notable vntruth saying. *That*

We have an expresse commaundement & many examples to the contrary of baptizing of infants. For there is neither any comaund, ment to forbid it, nor any example to the contrary, agaynst it, as I have shewed before.

OF THE SECOND POSITION
concerning the rebaptizing of
Elder People.

~~Mr. Clifton~~ Mr. Clifton

2. That Antichristians converted are to be admitted into the true Church by baptisme.

Mr. Clifton
Answer.

AS the former Position denyeth the baptizing of infants: so doth this adnihilate that Baptisme which we have received in the Apostate Church, and establisheth rebaptization. And this also I will shew to be an error by proving the contrarie, and then answer the Reasons hereunto annexed.

That baptisme administred in the apostate Churches of Antichrist is baptisme not to be iterated, thus I prove it.

I. Argument.

If the Apostacie of Israel did not so pollute circumcision that that it ceased to be the seal of Gods covenant to so many of the as repented: no more doth the Apostacie of our fore-Elders so pollute baptisme, that it ceaseth to be a sacrament to so many of them that turne unto God from their sinnes.

But the first is true. 2 Chron. 35. 11. 18. 21. els could not so many of Israel as came to Ierusalem have eaten the Paschever, seeing no uncircumcised might eat thereof. Ergo the second.

If it be objected that the apostacie is not alike the let it be shewed that the apostacie under Antichrist did make a nullitie of baptism,

Of the first Argument

& not the apostasie of Israel of circumcision: for Israel played the harlot so deeply, that the Lord denyed her to be his wife, or himself to be her husband. Hose. 2. 2.

Mr Smyth,

And thus having shewed the vanitie of your answeres to my reasons against *padobaptists*, let us come to your answer made to my 2. Position.

2. That Antichristians equall'd, &c. Your first Argument is framed thus.

If the apostasie of Israel, &c. I answer that the apostasie of Antichrist is deeper then the apostasie of Israel, for first Antichristians are not called Israelites, but Babylonians, Egyptians, Sodomites, Gentiles, in the Revelation, whereby the holy spirit of wisdom giveth us to conceive, that he doth account the apostasie of Antichrist equall to Paganisme it self, &c.

Rich: Clifton.

Whether my answers be vaine, or your reasons heretical, let the reader judge. For your answer to this my first Argument against your second Position, if it be graunted that the Apostasie of Antichrist be worse then of Israel, yet this difference is but according to the lesse & the greater, both are Apostasie. But as concerning these names of Sodomites, &c. they do not prove that Antichristianisme is equalled to Paganisme: rather they shew that the Antichristians were in some things like to the Sodomites, Egyptians, &c. Was Iuda her circumcision voyd because the Prophet calles their Princes, *the Princes of Sodome*, & the people *the people of Gomorah*? If this had bene so, they must have bene new circumcised. Know you not that the holy Ghost by these similitudes would manifest some abhominable sinne that he saw in his people wherein they became like unto the profane Gentiles? And the more to cause them to detest their sinne, likeneth them to such notorious sinners, as had tasted of the hand of God against them for their sinnes. Wherefore as Iudah for her uniuert shedding of blood and other filthy sinnes is called Sodome and Gomorah: So the Antichristians are called Sodome, for their filthy sinne of Sodomitrie, and such like, wherein they become like to the Sodomites; and Egypt and Babylon, because they keep Gods people under a spirituall seruitude, as formerly B.

against rebaptizing of Elder people.

151

gypt and Babylon had done the Israelites and Jewes under a corporal bondage. And the Antichristians, if they be compared to the Gentiles (which I do not remember) it is in respect of their profanenes and strange Gods: for as the Gentiles had many Gods, to whom they gave spiritual worship: so the Antichristians have their Gods, Saints of both sexes, and the Angels to whom they do worship and service. Notwithstanding all this their profanesse, yet did they confesse God and Jesus Christ to be their favour, and worshipped him (though corruptly) professed also many of his truthe, which neither the Sodomites, Egyptians, Babylonians or Gentiles did: And therefore are not comparable with the heathen in all respects, much lesse to be held the worst kind of Paganisme. For in Paganisme, it was never heard that God had his people, yet in Antichristian Babylon, the spirit witnesseth that he hath his people amongst them, and so many truthe of God are therein taught, as thereby Gods elect do come to some knowledge of God, and to faith: so can none do in Paganisme, by any doctrine there taught

2. *I declare plainly the difference between the Apostasie of Antichrist and Israels in this, that Israels apostasie did not destroy the true constitution of the Church; but Antichrists apostasie did raze the true Apostolike constitution. For the true constitution of the Church of the old Testament was of carnal Israelites or proselytes circumcised, and so long as they retheyned circumcision in the Land of Canaan, they retheyned a true constitution though there apostasie was never so great, &c.*

This which you say, is a playne difference, is none at all, it is your false ground that deceaves you. The reason of your difference wil not hold, for if retheyning of circumcision preserved the constitution of the Church of the old Testament, though their apostasie was never so great, as you say it did: then should the retheyning of baptism in the greatest apostasie, preserve the Churches constitution under the new testament: but this you deny, ergo the other can not stand: Seing baptism by your owne confession * is the constitution of the Church under the Gospel, as circumcision was of the old Church: Now if this be true doctrine which you teach, I pray you shew us some reason why Apostasie more raseth the constitution of the Church now, then it did under the law: for circumcision was as corruptly administered by the apostate Israelites, as baptism is by the Antichristians. But your iudgement of the Churches constitution

sayles

Of the first Argument against

sayles you, in holding the Sacraments to be the constitution thereof, in them appertayne vnto it, yet can they not be counted the whole constitution of the Church. And if this should be granted you, it would follow, that If Israels constitution was carnal (for circumcision you say was carnal) so should the constitution of the Church of the new testament be carnal also: seeing baptisme is an external ordinance as well as circumcision was, and both alike carnal in that respect. And therefore you must either renounce this opiniō, or els grant that the constitution of the Church of the old Testament was spiritual, & then all your building is overthrowne.

But to prove that Israel retein'd a true constitution in their apostacie, you alledge Hosea the fourth, saying: *Though their apostasy was neuer so great in their worship ministerie and government, as it is to be seen in Hosea, 4. 6. yet they retein'd a true constitution so long as they retein'd circumcision in the land of Canaan.*

I answer, although the Lord call Israel his people, he doth it in regard of his covenant formerly made to their forefathers, & not in respect of their present outward estate. The Prophet sayth, *There shall be like people like Priests.* And in verse 12. they are charged to go *a whoring from under their God.* How can this people be sayd to stand in a true constitution or covenant with God, that went a whoring from under their God? Hath Rome done any more then this? the people *perished for want of knowledge, and the Lord reiect'd their Ministers from being his; because they refused knowledge. The Israelites did ask counsel at their stocks, and the spirit of fornication caused them to erre, & they sacrificed to strange Gods, &c. *Jeroboam drove away the true Prophets, & placed Priests after his own devise.* Israel set up an other governement and *refused the governement of the Lord, & had a false ministerie and worship. What more can be sayd of Rome, then is here sayd of Apostate Israel? And what though the Prophet Abijah did not charge Israel with a false cōstitutio, but with the other particulars before mētioned; yet that sufficeth to declare that they had broken covenāt with God, which, what is it els, but to depart frō their primitive cōstitutio. Needs a man to say any more to prove that a wife hath violated the bond of marriage, but that she hath played the whore, and followeth other lovers? and so much have the Prophets testified of Israel. Azariah beareth witnes against Israel thus; *now for a long season Israel hath bene without the true God, & without Priests to teach, and without law.* And this was

in the

rebaptizing of Elder people.

153

the tyme of Aſa king of Iuda. Also Eliah complayneth that the children of Iſrael have forſaken the covenant of the Lord; and this was in the dayes of Ahab, now it cannot be that they that had forſaken Gods covenant could be a true conſtituted Church, ſo continuing, & alſo, which were without God and without his Law &c.

Can you ſay more againſt the Antichriftians? and then you deny to be a true Church; and yet you iuſtify Iſrael withal her abominations: but let vs conſider further of the difference you make between Iſrael and Antichriftianisme: you ſaye.

That Antichriſt hath not onely ſet up a falſe government &c. but alſo a falſe conſtitution of the Church, ſin whereas the true Apoſtolike conſtitution was of baptiſed Diſciples that confeſſed their ſins and their faith; he hath ſetted up a falſe matter of Church, viz. infants and perſons unbaptiſed, and ſo a falſe forme, &c.

I anſwere, 1. that the Apoſtolike conſtitution did not ſhut out the children of beleevors, as I have formerly proved. 2. I iuſtify neither the matter nor forme of Antichriſts Church, neither their miniſterie worſhip nor government; they have in all theſe corrupted the wayes of God. But the illhood you tax them of in their matter & forme, is the baptiſing of infants, otherwiſe if they had baptiſed perſons confeſſing their ſinnes, &c: their conſtitution had bene with you Apoſtolike: ſuch a deadly feud have you againſt infants, that to admit them to baptiſme makes a falſe Church. For the lawfullnes of baptiſing children you may be ſatiſfied before, if the ſight of your ſoule be not quite put out:

Your ſaying that infants are no more capable of baptiſme, then is a ſoole or mad-man or pagan, Argues in you the want of ſpiritual wiſdome, but that which you drive at, in this your bitterneſs againſt infants is to prove, *That the Church of Antichriſt is conſtituted of a falſe matter, viz. infants incapable of baptiſme, and a falſe forme; viz. infants unable to enter into the new Teſtament &c.* And therefore to be as Pagans or Gentiles in the Lords account; and to iuſtifie Apoſtate Iſrael reſecting circumciſion to be a true Church.

For your pleading againſt the adulteries of Rome I diſlike not: but by theſe your Arguments, & manner of pleading you ſhall never convince her, or ever be able to juſtifie that adulterous Church of Iſrael: neither will this your reaſon ſtand good. *That circumciſion in the Iſraelites Apoſtoly was true, becauſe it was performed upon carnal Iſraelites or profelytes the 8. day.* And that baptiſme in Popery is falſe and in the Lords account no better then Pagan waſhing, &c. for as much may be

V

ſayd

sayd for baptisme administred to the apostate Church of Antichrist, as you can say for circumcision in the Apostasie of Israel. And all that can be sayd is this, that neither of them both is in deed capable, in that standing: For the sacraments belong to the members of a true Church, not to apostates. But if to be circumcised the 8. day prove that Israels circumcision was true in her Apostacy; what letteth the circumcision of the Edomites and Ismaelites to be true also, they keeping the 8. day, seeing they were of the seed of Abraham. The right of circumcision belonged to the children of the promise which was made to Abraham in Christ: And therefore when any of Abrahams seed did cut off themselves by infidelitie, their circūcisiō became uncircumcision: on the contrary, circumcision, though administred in Apostacy vnto infants, yea * those coming to yeares and seeking the Lord, their circumcision was then profitable to them. And so is baptisme in like manner to them that receive it in apostate Churches, when they by repentance shall returne to God. But you drive all to this yssue, that not the profanes of the apostasie, but the fittines of the subject makes the sacrament true or false. That infants are as fit subjects for baptisme, as the infants under the law, for circumcision, I haue proved in the former part of this writing.

Your third answer. 3. I declare that Israel was the true church of God, or a member of a true Church, though infinitely corrupt: as wel as Iuda in the dayes of her apostasie, &c. and therefore if Iudah reneyed true circumcision in her apostasie &c. surely the circumcision of Israel was also true.

This is strange that Israel can be a true Church, & yet infinitely corrupt, as a wife be a true wife & also a harlot? thus you may as wel iustify Rome & all Antichristian assemblies. The holy ghost calleth both * Aholah and Aholibah harlots: and you in their infinite corruptions iustifie them to be true Churches, and particularly of Israel the Lord sayth, † *plead with your mother for she is not my wife*. And you say, she was a true Church, that is, a true wife, directly contradicting the holy Ghost. But you reason, *If Iudah reneyed true circumcision in her apostasie, then Israell, &c.*

Then if eyther Iuda her circumcision was false, or that your comparison is not equall, your argument is of no force. The sacraments scale up Gods covenant to his people walking in his wayes, and not to them when they

the rebaptizing of elder people

they fall from the faith. That of Hosea . 2. 1. alledged by some as you say, to Prove Israel a false Church you thus answer unto.

I say it was after the Passover of Ezechias which was in the first yeare of his reigne. 2 Chron. 29. 3. 14. and 30. 2. and the bill of divorce was given the first yeare of his reigne, 2 King. 17. 23. compared with 2 King. 18. 10. yet notwithstanding Hosea calleth Israel the Lords people after he had prophesied of the bill of divorce to be given her. Hose. 4. 6. 8. 12. &c.

Concerning the time of Hosea his prophesie, when he sayd, plead with your mother, &c. I take it was in the dayes of Vzziah king of Iuda and about the 23. yeare of his reigne, which was almost 60. yeres before Ezechias began to reigne, and before the Lord put Israel out of his sight. Now so long before the prophet was bidden to tel Israel that she was not the Lords wife. This being so, I would know how you or any can iustify Israel to be a true church, when the Lord denyes her? she had broken covenant, & her divorcement (as you call it) argues as much: for men put from their wives that had broken the band of marriage, and not true wives.

To that of Hosea, 4. 6. 8. 12. I have answered, pag. 152. Further more you say, When the bil of divorce was given, divers of Israel kept themselves from Samaritanisme and went yearly to Ierusalem.

I doubt thereof no more then you, according to these scriptures, 2. Chron. 34. 6. 7. 31. 32. 33. and 35. 18. and 30. 11. but we reason of the face of that Church, as it stood in apostasie and so continued, and not of particular persons. In Babylon God hath his; yet the face of that Church of ANTICHRIST is apostate and false to the LORD. And so we say of Israel, that if we respect the outward face of it, it was a false Church to God long before Samaritanisme began. And here I observe that you agree not with your self, for here you say, no manner of sinne made the Church of the old testament, a false Church: and yet you call it apostate, as also you do the like in your Paralels, pag. 14. and 26. And it is as much as we say of it: for that people that are fallen into apostasie have broken faith and covenant with God. And if in any place we call Israel or Antichrists, a false Church, we meane no other, but a Church that hath unfaithfully departed from the LORD, and so continues in Apostasie.

Hosea

* Part
Specimen
&c. pag.
† 2. K
17-23.

II. Argument.

Babylon in Chaldea (which was a type of spirituall Babylon, Reve. 18. 2.) though she did abuse and profane the vessels of the Lord, Dan. 5. 3. yet did not that make a nullitie of them, that they ceased any more to be the vessels of the house of the Lord, but were brought with them of the captivitie that came up from Babylon, to Ierusalem. Ezra. 1. 11. Even so although spirituall Babylon have profaned the holy things of God, as baptisme & the rest, yet remaine they still Gods ordinances to all them that come out of her, Rev. 18. 4. and returne to the celestiaall Ierusalem. And as these vessels of the house of the Lord need not to be new cast, because of Babels polluting them: no more is baptisme to be iterated to the people of God, because it passed through the polluted hands of the Papists.

If it be objected, that they that administered baptisme in Babylon were Idolaters and had no calling therevnto: I answer, that they which circumcised in the Apostacy of Israel were Idolaters, & so standing in that estate could not be fit Ministers of Gods holy ordinances. And that the wanting of a lawfull calling to administer the Sacrament, makes not a nullitie thereof, the circumcising of Moses sonne by his mother Zippora, Exo. 4. 25. doth playnly teach: For as the Lord makes effectuall his word to his people though coming vnto them by the hands of a false Ministry: so doth he baptisme to all that be his, though administered by them that have not a lawfull calling therevnto. The sin of the Minister makes not a nullitie eyther of the word or Sacraments, els should the efficacy of the word and Sacraments depend vpon him that administred them; which is not so; for both have their effect from the Lord Esay. 55. 11:

If agayne it be objected that baptisme was not administred in the

rebaptizing of Elder people.

the Apostate Church of Antichrist to a fit subject. I answer, that the children in the Apostacy were as fit subjects to receive baptism, as the infants of Israel in the tyme of Ieroboam & Ahab were to receive circumcision: seing the covenant of Abraham (after the coming of Christ) belonged as properly to the Gentiles Gal. 3. 14. as before it did to the Israelites.

Mr Smyth.

I answer many things. 1. this Argument is an excellent argument for the retyning of idol Temples, the worship, government, ministerie of the ecclesiastical assemblies of England, &c.

Rich: Clifton

This Argument is not so excellent for idol Temples, &c. as you pretend. For how can you reason from the ordinances of God to justify the devises of men? wil it follow, that because the vessels of the Lord, his sacraments and ordinances (though polluted in apostaticall Churches, or by the profane Babylonians) may be restored to the right use, for which God ordeyned them, therefore so to reason, justifies the inventions of men deviated to religious uses? you may shew your wit in composing of your Argument. But with all you answer. *That baptisme of theirs was never appointed by God, but is the devise of Antichrist.*

Antichrist devised no new baptisme, but polluted the Lords ordinance ordeyned by God.

2. *I answer that. the vessels of the Lords house were his owne ordinances, & they need not to be new cast. But the baptisme of Antichrist is not the Lords owne ordinance &c.*

Baptisme retyened in the Churches of Antichrist is as much the Lords ordinance, as the vessels of the Temple were in Babylon, and therefore needs no more to be new cast, then they. But you distinguish betwene the vessels of the Lords house and baptisme, thus. *That they were substances framed by art into particular shapes at the Lords appointment: but the baptisme*

of the Lord is a compound or concrete ordinance limited in certain essential parts, not being a substance, but an accident in definition. Now if Antichrist had retoynd the essential parts of baptisme I confesse it needed not to be repeated, &c. but seeing baptisme in Popery is not the Lords ordinance but Antichrists invention, the matter and forme being invented by Antichrist, the matter being a carnal infant, the forme washing one into the covenant and cannot consent to the covenant or baptising, without a contract, and sealing to the covenant &c.

Here you confesse that if the essentiall partes of baptisme be retoynd in Popery, it is not to be repeated. But you make question about the parts, affirming that both matter and forme of baptisme in Popery is invented by Antichrist: you say so, but proves it not. Concerning the matter, it is before shewed, that infants are capable of baptisme, not as they be natural and borne in sinne, but as they are the seed of the faithful, & therefore being the children of God, and of the "covenant, are not in that respect carnal matter, but spiritual. As for the forme, which you say, is the washing of one into the covenant which cannot consent. I answer, that the forme of baptisme doth not any more stand in the Actual consent of the parties baptised, then the forme of circumcision did consist in the assenting of the party circumsised: for there is alike reaso of the form of these two sacraments, and therefore as infants of the Iewes were circumsised, notwithstanding by reason of their age they could not consent to that action: So infants of beleevvers may be baptised, especially seeing they are but patients in this Action. This is the Lords ordinance, to baptise the beleever and his seed with water, into the name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the holy Ghost. And of this are infants capable.

As for sealing to the covenant, it is already proved that the Lord sealeth his covenant to infants. And for their sealing to the Lord, they do as much, as at that age is required, or was required of the infants of the Iewes circumsised. Nether is there baptisme without a contract, for the Lord hath made his covenant with the faithfull and their seed. For the Scripture describeth true baptisme thus: The matter must be one, that consisteth his faith and his sinne one that is regenerate and borne againe. The form must be a voluntary deliverance of the party baptised into the name of the Father, Sonne and holy Ghost, by washing with water. Mat. 28. 19. and 3. 6. Job. 4. 1. 2. Et. 2. 14. and 2. 38. 27. with Rom. 6. 3—6. Where there must be a mutual consent of both persons contracting together. And thus it is so, the forme of baptisme retoynd in Popery, yet teacheth &c.

Thus

That the matter of baptisme (as you terme it) or subject, must necessarily be one alwayes that confesseth his sayth and synnes, al that you have said hitherto, hath not proved it: the scripture sayth it not: and the contrary is confirmed before, viz. that infants are to be baptised, although they can not make actual profession of their sayth, & to us they are partakers of remission of synns and regeneration: seeing they are in the covenant.

2. Concerning the forme of baptisme, I confesse it is the sprinkling of a fit subject with water into the name of the Father &c. but your voluntarie deliverance up of the partie baptised, to make that action a part of the forme of baptisme, al the scriptures you cite, proves it not. we confesse that such as are of yeares must voluntarily offer up themselves to be baptised, and so were they that were to be circumcised: notwithstanding the infants that could not do this, were also circumcised, & so must our infants be baptised. The Lord sayd to his Ministers, baptise, but sayd not let every one that is baptised offer himself voluntarily thereunto, as he doth in the Lords supper, say, take eat &c. it is otherwise in baptisme, wherein the baptised are not agents, but onely patients: God thus disposing that the infants of the faithful might be capable thereof, & sealed up for the Lords, as well as their parents. And it is to be noted, that the desiring or offering to receive baptisme, is an action differing from the thing desired, & so not a part of the same. As for your mutual consent of both persons contracting together, it must be understood, of God with the saythfull & their seed, for such was the contract or covenant making with Abraham, which continues still in force to al believers & their seed: & this precedeth baptisme, & is no part of the external forme thereof. Gen. 17. 1, 7. &c. Act. 2. 39.

And for that forme of baptizing in poperie, with *credis & credo*, &c. which others speak for the Infant, declaring (as you say) that there must needs be a mutual contract &c. You know very wel how it is continued upō a blynd custome & imitation, because such as were to be received into the church in the primitive tymes, and to be baptised, being of yeares, did make confession of their sayth, & answered to such interrogatories as were demanded of them concerning the same. This the papists apply to infants, the questions being answered by the godfathers who are sayd to be brought in by Higinus before whose time, the parents presented their children to be baptised. This corrupt custome & apish imitation, your self hath condemned. Yet now having cast off baptisme it self, you scrape in the filthy Dunghill of Poperie to advantage your selfe against the truth, whose practise you know condemnes your opinion of not baptizing of infants. If therefore

Yf therefore you will crave their testimony for your forme of baptisme, why dispute you their witness of baptising of infants, which is the matter. And thus much for answer to your description of baptisme.

Now concerning the outward ceremony of baptisme, the Scripture thus teacheth, that the element in this sacrament is * water onely, the forme of administering thereof, Christ commaunded thus, *baptise them into the name of the father, and of the sonne & of the holy ghost*. This is that which the Lord hath instituted, whereby he would signify and seale unto his people "the remission of their sinnes, * and the ingrafting into Christ, † the mortification of the old man and renewing of the spirit. This is the substance of this ceremony, and is found to be stil retayned in the Apostate Churches. And therefore, although it hath bene polluted by the hands of Apostates, as the vessels of the Temple were by the Babylonians, and by adding of humane inventions, yet is it in substance that which Christ ordeyned in his Church, neither the element nor forme of administration changed, and therefore not to be iterated. Your third answer.

3. I answer that if the Antichristians had baptised persons confessing their sinnes of their faith into the name of the sonne of God and the Trinitie, it had been true baptisme, though in the hands of the Antichristians, &c.

First, you confesse then, that the apostasie of Antichrist is not so great, but that in the papal Churches there may be true baptisme; not to be iterated. That they baptised with water into the name of the father and of the sonne and of the holy ghost, can not be denyed, all that you except against, is the administering of it to infants; & so this second question is answered in the former: for if the infants are to be baptised, then stands their baptisme good without repeating which they have in Apostate Churches.

Lastly, where I sayd, that the wanting of a lawfull calling to administer the Sacrament made not a nullitie thereof; instancing the circumcision of the Israelites by Apostats, and of Zippora her circumcising of her sonne, you answered saying.

What say you to Cyprian and al that counsel of learned Bishops who concluded that, baptisme of Hereticks was a nullitie and decreed rebaptising.

This I answer, that if Cyprian and those learned Bishops did erre what is that to this purpose; for those examples that I have alledged are such as are recorded by the holy ghost to be done, not by such as had lawfull calling.

ing, and yet stood without recircumcising. But suppose Cyprian & those Bishops found that some were baptised by Hereticks and not in the name of the Trinitie, (for seeing some denyed the Deitie of Christ, some his humanity, others held other errors about the Trinitie: It is not like that they would observe the true forme of baptism, but some strange forme of their owne devise; as some report (how truly I know not) that you baptise your selves into the fayth of the new Testament.) And so decreed not re-baptising, but baptising of them that were not before baptised with Christs baptism. Indeed it is recorded by some, that the *Novatians, Arrians, Arians & Donatists*, did as you do, rebaptise those that fell to their errors, which had been baptised before into the name of the Trinitie. Lastly, if Cyprian & those Bishops did erre about this poynt of rebaptising, as in some others they did, I am no patron of their errors.

2. I say, that the *Israelites* circumcision was in a true church and *Antichrists* baptism was in a false, and that is a dissimilitude.

That *Israel* in her Apostasie was not a true church, I have shewed before: how you in this disagree with your self, here I will set down your own words in your book of *Parabels &c.* against *M. Barnard* pag. 14. thus you write. *A church falsely constituted (as in the old Testament was the apostate church of the 10. Tribes, and in the new Testament is the Church of Antichrist) is such a communion of men, whereto God hath not given the covenant, the blessings, the promises, Christ for King, Priest and Prophet. &c.* *Alforin* pag. 26. of the same book, you answering such as plead that they have the Word, Sacraments, & conversion in the English Assemblies, have these words. *I say it is but as a thief hath the true manns purse, and as the false church of Ieroboams had, and as the Samaritanes, & domites &c. had circumcision & the sacrifices by usurpation.* Here you have testified to the world that *Ieroboams* church was a false church, falsely constituted &c. And now seeing a disadvantage thereby to your new erroneous opinion, you doubt not to call it a true church. This inconstancie befits not him that will be a leader of others.

3. I know nothing to the contrarie but *Zippora* might circumcise her sonne, her husband and commanding her. For where is it sayd in the old Testament, that a woman should not circumcise? for *Moses* did circumcise though *Zippora* was the hand of *Moses* in that action. &c.

When you deal against us about baptising of infants, you will have commandment

commandment or example, or els you reiect it as Antichristian, now being pressed with this Act of Zippora you shew neither, nor any reason for the lawfulness of the fact and yet you defend it, answering, that you know nothing to the contrary, but Zippora might circumcise her son &c.

What needes the Scripture to forbid women to circumcise, when for the administering of that ceremony God gave commandment that Abraham the head of the family should circumcise all his males, as baptism is now enjoined to the Apostles and Ministers of Christ; the which commandments dislike all others, whether women or men that have not such calling from God for the administration therof. That Zippora did circumcise her sonne by Moses commandment appeares not in the Scripture, but that she being grieved at her husbands neglect, did it: But if Moses ought to do it himselfe, the question is whether he might command his wife to do it. The non-residents in England are condemned for preaching by their substitutes, and you defend that a woman may be a substitute to administer a sacramēt. If Zipporah may circumcise in case of necessitie at the appointment of her husband, why may not the midwives in case of necessitie baptise; by the appointment of the Priests? You pretend rule, but in this you practise it not.

4. I yeeld that the Minister shall not preiudice baptism, if the baptism be the Lords owne ordinance, &c.

In this we agree that the Minister, if he be not lawfully called, doth not so farre preiudice baptism, as to make a nullitie of it, what is further here to be answered, is done els where.

The 2. obiection you answer is, that although baptism be administered in a false Church of Antichrist upon an unfit subiect, yet it shall not be repeated, no more then circumcision in the dayes of Jeroboam, &c. My words were these. That the children in that apostasie, are as fit subiects to receive baptism, as the infants of Israel in the dayes of Jeroboam were so receive circumcision. And you pervert my wordes and say, that I affirme, that although baptism be administered in a false Church upon an unfit subiect. Is this to confesse that infants are unfit subiects to say, they were as fit as the infants of Israel?

Your self doth acknowledge that the infants of ISRAEL in that Apostasie were capable of circumcision. I sayd that the infants of the Antichristians were as capable as they, not approving of the state of eyther, but arguing that if the former might stand for circumcision, then also the other without iterating the state of the Antichristians, being alike to the apostate Israelites:

but I will come to your further answer, which is this.

I say that the Israelites infants in their defection were the subject that God com-
manded to be circumcised: so are not the infants in Antichristianisme, both for that
they are 1. infants. 2. members of a false Church 3. the seed of unbelievers.

That the Israelites infants in their defection were commanded to be circum-
cised, can not be proved; God is no approver of apostasie. When he gave
to Abraham and his seed circumcision, he did intend that it should seal
his covenant unto them, and that they should continue therein, and not
apostate: and therefore (to speak properly) the Israelites in their apostasie
could be no fit subjects, although upon their repentance the Lord let
stand their circumcision.

And so if the state of this people be rightly co-
sidered; the dissimilitude between their circumcision, and baptism in An-
tichristian assemblies, will not prove such as you pretend.

Your rea-
sons to prove infants in Antichristianisme to be no fit subjects of baptism,
are of no weight.

The first of them is answered in the
former part of this writing; where is proved that infants are fit subjects
of baptism.

Concerning the 2. I might ask you why you make infants
members of Antichrists Church, and deny them to be members of true
Churches? but to let this passe, I answer, that this reason is of no force,
saying your self confesseth, that if Antichrist had baptized persons confessing their
sins, &c. it had bene true baptism.

To the third I answer, that the in-
fants in Antichristianisme are no more the seed of unbelievers, then the
infants in Ieroboams Church were the seed of unbelievers: both were the
seed of apostates, and that is all you can say of them.

Their parents,
(although apostating from many truths, and polluted with mens inven-
tions,) yet were not fallen from all profession of Iesus Christ, but stil did
and do acknowledge salvation by him, receave and beleeve many many
grounds of faith, & excellent truths, & so many, as the Lord hath his peo-
ple in * Babylon brought to the knowledge of God by those doctrines.

there taught. And therefore thus I think of such apostates, that in respect
of their outward standing they remaine in apostasie, having forsaken many
truthes, pollute Gods ordinances, practise the cursed inventions of men;

yet professing faith in God & in Iesus Christ (though corruptly) I can not
hold them as infidels simply, but as the Israelites in their apostasie, and
their seed may rather be termed the seed of Apostates, then of infidels or
unbelievers.

And

And whereas you say that the covenant of Abraham in respect of Christ did truly belong to the Gentiles after the coming of Christ as it did to the Israelites though both in defection: I deny it: for the carnal covenant belonged to the Israelites the carnal seed of Abraham even in their parents Apostacy, and the spiritual covenant did never appertain to the Apostate parents. 2. much les to the infants of them &c. 3. nor to the infants of the faithful as I have already proved, and Gal 3. 14. is not to be understood of the blessing of Abraham to come vpon any of the Gentiles in their Apostacy, but only being in Christ as the words are, also ver 7. and 9. &c.

I speak comparatively of the seeds of the apostate Israelites and Antichristians, affirming the one as fit subjects for baptism, as the other for circumcision, because the Gentiles since Christ, have as much title to the covenant with Abraham, as the Israelites had: This you deny, shifting off with your devised carnal covenant. It is not for the spirituall covenant or Sacrament, to belong to Apostates, that I contend: I know it belongs to the faithful and their seed, though you say no. But this was the end wherefore I did alledge Gal. 3. 14. to prove that the covenant is enlarged to the Gentiles and that they may now make as iust claime to it for themselves and their seed; as Israel could doe: And therefore did reason thus: If the children of Israel could chalendg right to the covenant and circumcision, their parents being in Apostacy: then might the infants of Apostates in Antichristianisme do so: and this is all that I sayd, not iustifying the standing of the one or of the other.

I I I. Argument.

IF the word of God passing through the false Ministry of Antichrist was of force to convert Gods elect in Babilon: Then is baptism passing likewise through their false ministry, of force to seale vp Gods covenant vnto them; and so consequently not to be iterated.

But the first is true. Apoc. 18. 4. for in babilon were Gods people converted; other ordinary Ministry was there none, but that false Ministry of the Papists, and therefore it is apparant that God made thereby his word effectuell to all them that beleaved

Ergo

ago &c. If it be objected, that if God should convert his people by an Antichristian Ministry, it were to give Approbation to a false Ministry, and to teach that men might lawfully use it, which is absurd. I answer, for vs to use a false Ministry is unlawful: but it is no more absurd, or yet any approbation of a false Ministry for God to worke thereby the good of his owne people, then it was his approving of the evil service of Iosephs brethren selling him into Egypt, because he used their Ministry for the saving of Jacob and his household; for God can worke good by an evil instrument.

If it be still urged that the Antichristian Ministers had no calling to baptise: I say no more had the Iewes to put Christ to death: yet was his suffering avaylable to save al that beleever; and so is the Sacrament to al Gods people avaylable to seale vp salvation vnto them.

Mr. Smyth.

I answer. First the word converteth none visibly vnto me particularly known: so Answer. Baptisme seale vp none visibly vnto me &c.

Rich. Clyfton

Although Gods people continuing in Babylon cannot so wel be discerned; yet by their coming thence, they manifest to me particularly, that there they were converted by the word, and so appeare visibly vnto me to belong vnto God, and to be children of the covenant. As for the tyme before, we take no publike notice of their secreete estate before God, nor can do for the things revealed belong vnto vs. Further you say.

The marke of the Beast is undoubtedly baptisme, whereby they are marked vnto Antichrist, and receive his mark as Christs servants in baptisme receive his seale vnto him, &c.

X

Oh how fearful a thing is it to blaspheme: baptism is the ordinance of God though it was polluted by Antichrist, you may as well say, the word of God is the marke of the beast: for Antichrist did pollute it also as you formerly have confessed. Your mark of the beast reacheth verie farr even to the Apostles tymes, as the Auncients have witnessed of the baptism of Infants. And if this was the mark of the beast, then was the mark before the beast, which is absurd to affirme: for can the beast before it be in esse, make it both great and small to receive a $\dagger$ mark in their right hand or in their forehead. And that this baptising of infants was before the beast was, we have shewed out of the scriptures, and it may appear out of *Origene*, *Tertullian* and others, that speak of infants baptism to be in practise in the church, before their tyme, as in the former part of this writing is observed. And it appeares both by the * Revelation. And that of the Apostle in 2 Thes. 2, 3. that the man of synne arose not to this height and power to make small and great to receive his marke until there came a departing first. And seeing this marke of Antichrist was such as small and great, rich and poor, free and bound did receive, it can not be, the baptising of infants. For then onely the small should be sayd to receive it. And therefore the marke must be such a one, as shall agree to all persons "great and small, rich and poor, bound and free, and be received of them in that condition and state. And it must be such a marke, as they that worship the beast and his image shall receive by a $\dagger$ willing and actual consent, the which can not be applied to infants: for neither can they worship the beast or give voluntarie consent to receive his marke in their hands or foreheads.

2. Antichrists baptism false (as I have sayd) in the definition, is none of Gods ordinance, nor yet in the hands of the most faithful Minister, but Gods Word is the Lords ordinance, though in the mouth of the most vile Judas or Antichristian, yet though it be in the mixture of a 1000. heresies.

The same Lord that gave his word to his church, ordeyned also baptism to be therein. Indeed if baptism had been devised by Antichrist or any man els, it were not to be reputed for true baptism at all, but that baptism which is found to be in the Antichristian assemblies, is not Antichrists, the contrarie is proved before.

So that in this respect also it followes not, that Gods Word may convert in papery, therefore Antichrists baptism may seal, &c.

It wil follow, that as the word in Poperie, so baptism in that Apostasie

strayed since the primitive constitution of the church of Rome in the Apostles dayes, & as the word in operie may covert, so baptism may seal the that are Christs, being converted, for God can as wel blesse the one as the other. Gods word doth convert in Babilō, yet is not the promise any more annexed to that outward ministerie of Antichrist, then that blessing, ** bring forth fruit and multiplie*, is by Gods ordinance tyed to unlawful conjunctions, but it pleaseth the L. by the ministerie of his word & ordinance to effect his own work in al such as shal be saved, though through the hands of apostates.

3. You say, *If Antichrist had retained the Lords true baptism, &c. viz. that he had baptised persons confessing their sinnes and sayth in their minie, it should not have been repeated.* But seeing he intendeth in baptism to set an indelible character upon them, which is the marke of the beast, so conferre grace, *ex opere operato*, to the infants which he washeth &c. hence I conclude, that he hath sett upp his owne idoll of abhominatian, and cast the LORDS holy ordinance away, &c. Ergo, his baptism is a nullitie or rather a seal of perdition &c.

Your self by your heresie sets up an idol of abhominatian and casts away the Lords holy ordinance of sealing his covenant to his people & their seed. And here againe you destroy one of your reasons which you brought against the baptizing of infants, which was, ** because they were members of a false church.* for you confesse, that if Antichrist had baptised persons confessing their sinnes &c. it should not have been repeated. So that to be members of a false church shal not hinder the efficacy of baptism. Again if Antichrist intendeth in baptism to set an indelible character to conferre grace, *ex opere operato*, to infants, and therefore setteth upp his owne idoll (as you say) what say you to his baptizing of the Indians which are of yeares? For he intendeth the same thing. And yet his so baptizing of the elder sort, &c. you will not have repeated. So by your own opinion to set an indelible character to conferre grace, *ex opere operato*, is no good reason to prove the iterating of childrens baptism, for then should it do so in the elder people confessing their sinnes &c.

As for the promise made by others for the partic baptised, I place (as a devise of man) amongst the accidental corruptions of this Sacrament. Concerning persons cōfessing their sins & sayth, who you make the onely subject of baptism, I have answered before. And here tel you that the scripture mentioneth persons that were baptised; yet sayth not a word, that they confessed their faith & syns. And you can never prove that al in the familie of Stephanas

* Gen. 1

Answ.

Rep.

* Caral. pag. 32.

1 Cor. 12. 13.

Stéphanas, Tiddiah, &c. did confesse their finnes and sayth: but to all that you say here, answer is given before.

III. Argument.

THose holy things, which God by his merciful providence hath preserved for his people, through the hands of prophane persons are not to be rejected for the authors sake.

Ezra. 1:11, But the scriptures and baptisme, hath God preserved in the popish assemblies for the benefit of his people. Therefore not to be rejected for the Authors sake.

If it be objected against the Minor, it is not true baptisme but false that is administred in the Assemblies of Antichrist: I answer, though it may be sayd to be false in regard of some humane devices used in the administration thereof: yet is it true baptisme in respect of the matter, forme, and author thereof, which causeth it to have a true being.

Mr Smyth.

I answer directly that if it could be proved that baptisme in the kingdome of Antichrist is appointed by Christ, and that water is the true matter of baptisme, and the true forme is washing into the Trinitie, I would yield unto you, but this you have not proved &c. but to deal something more fully, &c. 1. Water is not the matter of baptisme, but onely the instrument. &c.

R. Clyfton.

FIRST I have proved that baptisme which is administred in the Antichristian churches is not to be iterated: but that Christ appointed baptisme in the kingdome of Antichrist, I do not affirm; onely this I say, that Christ ordeyned this sacrament for his church, which becoming Apostate & yet retaining the same is notwithstanding baptisme, because it is of God. And

I affirme that Christ is the Author of baptisme, which the Antichristians pollute by their administration thereof, as God was the author of that circumcision observed in the apostate church of Israel. And therefore as circumcision received of the Israelites in their Apostasie, stood as the seal of Gods covenant to so many as repented: So baptisme received in Babylon confirmeth the promise to al Gods people departing thence, and returning to walk in the wayes of the Lord.

But concerning the matter and forme of baptisme you charge me to have sayd in my answer to your second Argument, *That water is the matter, and the forme washing with water into the Trinitie.* In calling water the matter, ifso it had pleased you, you might have understood my meaning, viz. that I understood thereby the outward signe or element, whereof in Poperie was no change. They used the same which Christ ordeyned. And in calling it the matter, I did not intend the subject or partie baptised (which I know must be also one that beleeveth, or the seed of such,) but considering what Christ ordeyned to be observed in this Ceremonie, I found these: water, and the baptising therewith into the name of the father, &c. The former I called the matter or element wherewith the partie is baptised; meaning that material outward signe, that Christ ordeyned in this sacrament as in the other, he hath done the like. For it was not in my thought to intend, that if the water be administred with this forme of words, that it is baptisme without a fit subject to be baptised: Nay I hold it an error in the Papists which baptise their bells, and will have bread consecrated (as they speak) to be a sacrament, though it be never received but layed up in a box.

Concerning the subject of baptisme or matter (as you terme it) I will not contend: but in that you denye the Infants of believers to be fit matter of baptisme, the contrarie I affirme and have proved before.

2. *I say that washing into the name of the father of the sonne & of the Holy Ghost, is not the forme of baptisme: for to wash a Turke, Jew, Foole, madman or Infant into the Trinitie is not true baptisme, &c.*

I answer, first, I know that formes can not consist without their subjects; & therefore I say, the forme of baptising is reteyned in Poperie, applied to infants, though corruptly in that standing. Secondly, I stand not to defend, that to baptise an unfit subject is true baptisme: but this, that the baptisme of Apostates is not to be iterated when they repent and turne to God no more.

no more then the circumcision of the Israelites in the like cause, 2 Chro. 30. 15. 11. as before I have shewed.

3. That infants are to be baptised, I have already proved. And to baptise a Jewe, Turke, Foole &c. continuing in their infidelitie, madnes &c. we do not affirme it lawfull, nor yet the baptisme of Apostats, for all such abuse that holy ceremony being guilty thereof, as they are of the body and blood of Christ, that receive it unworthely 1 Cor. 11.

4. The true forme of baptisme consists in 3. things 1. Washing with water 2. a new creature, 3. into the name of Christ or into the Trinitie.

This might also be graunted, saving that by new creature, you mind onely such as are of yeares, and so appere to vs new creatures by their profession, excluding infants, who also must be so accepted of vs in respect of the covenant, whereof they are partakers, as well as their parents. Also the children of the faithful may be esteemed new creatures, seeing they are holy: and are so to be accounted til they manifest themselves otherwise, which may be the case of old persons, as of S. Magus &c. And the Apostle in the place alledged, speaketh of such as are of yeares; and by the speech of a new creature, implyeth a special use and fruite of the thing signified by the outward signe, and so is not a part of the external forme of baptisme † as by man it is administred.

5. But if an infant &c. be washed with water into the Trinitie. I say there is neither true matter nor forme: And so all infants baptised by Antichrist &c. are to renounce it and so receive Christs marke of baptisme &c. and when they shal manifest a new creature &c. and then be baptised into the Trinitie, this is not Anabaptistry, but the true apostolick baptisme: and so Christ, Iohn, and Christs Apostles were Anabaptists, with you. Sir. &c. for they baptised men that were washed before, a thousand tymes with the Jewes baptisme, Heb. 9. 19 &c. if it be blasphemy to say Christ, Iohn, or the Apostles were anabaptists, though they were oftentimes some of them baptised into the Messiah in type &c. so shall it be blasphemy in them that call the true Christians Anabaptists &c.

6. Sir, if you mind wel your comparison it holds not, for those washings under the law were proper ordinances of the old Testamēt, declaring their repentance † and cleansing from their dayly sinnes, and pollutions by faith in Christ then to come; But baptisme (whereof we speak) is an ordinance of the Gospel, and that but one, as their circumcision likewise was, and therefore being once administred (though in some corruption) is Anabaptisme

against rebaptizing of elder people.

baptisme, to be iterated. And it is such a washing as preacht in
is the purging of our finnes by Christ. And therefore it is better
then washings under the law that can make men *ANABAPTISTS*:
TISTS: for you know in what sense people now are called *ANABAPTISTS* viz. for their rejection of the baptisme of the Gospel
which they have received, and Baptizing themselves againe, as you have
our in practise. And seeing that which was administered in the
Popish Assemblies, is Baptisme; it wilbe no blaspheiny in vs to cal them
ANABAPTISTS that have there with bene once baptised
and do recounce it, and take to themselves a new of mans invention.
What els is here sayd, is answered before.

And thus I conclude the confirmation of this fourth Argument, that
although the *POPISH CHURCHES* be apostate, the
MINISTRY WORSHIP AND GOVERNMENT false; yet the word and baptisme therein reteayned (being the
Lords ordinances) are not to be reiected with their pollution, but (purged
from their staynes) stil to be reteayned, and with Gods people to be carried
with them out of spiritual *BABYLON*, as the Iewes did the vessels
of the Lords house out of *Babylon of Chaldeas*. For the precept concern-
ing *Apostate Churches* is to take away their fornications, and not the
things of God polluted therewith.

f H
Rco. 11

V. Argument.

IF Antichrist be not the author of Baptisme, but of some hu-
mane devises annexed unto it in the administratio thereof: then
are we not to pluck vp the wheat with the tares, Mat. 13. 29. &
to cast away that which is Christs with Antichrists, but to sepa-
rate from that which is mans invention, and still to reteyne
that which is of God. But to baptise with water into the name
of the father and of the sonne and of the holy Ghost, Mat. 28. 19
is from heaven, Mat. 27. 25. and not from Antichrist. Ergo,
we ought not to cast it away, but those traditions wherewith An-
tichrist hath polluted it, as examples, K. Iosias, and before him
K. Ezechias, when both the land and Temple were polluted,

Of the first Argument against

Matting. 21. 7. & 23. 4. did not pul downe the Temple, but appointed the Preists to cleanse it, who did so, and brought out all the uncleannes that they had found in the house of God; 2 Chro. 29. 16.—18. and 34. 8. For in reformation of things, difference must be put betweene those things whereof God is the authour, and such as are devised by man: the former is to be purged from all profanation, & the things still to be reteyned: the other quite to be abolished. This rule in all reformation of religion ought to be followed.

Mr Smyth.

I answer, that as when the Babylonians had utterly destroyed the Temple, the Iewes built it agayne: so when Antichrist hath utterly destroyed the true Church, then must we build it up agayne. And when he hath destroyed true baptisme, then must we rear it up agayne, therefore seeing Antichrist hath abolished the true baptisme, and hath reared up a baptisme of his owne, it must therefore be abolished, &c.

R. Glyston.

First I answer, that baptisme in apostate Churches, though it be polluted, yet can not be sayd to be utterly destroyed, And therefore your answer is not sufficient to prove the rebaptising of them that were baptised in the Antichristian assemblies.

2. In reiecting of that baptisme altogether, and baptising a new, you doe renounce that which is true therein, by your owne confession. viz. *To wash with water, into the name of the father, and of the sonne, and of the holy Ghost;* in that in your new baptising of your selves you repeat it agayne, which you ought not, if it be of God; and so indeed you reteyne not any truth in it at all.

3. As for your comparison of a false Church or Ministry with baptisme, it is not equal: for if you vnderstand by false Church and Ministry, that which is devised by man onely: then the constitutions thereof are not of Gods ordinance; as in Iereboams Preists, and as in Provincial or Diocesan Churches.

rebaptizing of Elder people.

Churches, wherein not one beame, rather on stone, is appointed by the Lord, and therefore can not be reteyned with the purging away of the corruptions therof. But in baptisme, (I meane that which is administrated in Popery) there remaines, *the washing with water into the name of the Trinitie*, which you with the tares pluck vp and cast in to the fyre.

4. Whereas you say, *That, in the false baptisme, Church, and Ministry, the corruptions are essential and the truth onely accidental, and those accidental truthe must be severed, and iterated.* I demaunde of you what be these accidental truthe in a false Baptisme, Church and Ministry, that are to be iterated?

And how you prove such iteration of accidents in baptisme: if you say, *That to baptise with water into the name of the father &c.* be an accident to baptisme, then is it not of the essence therof, but Christ maketh this applie to a right subject, the form of baptisme: And your self a litle before have soth written, how if it be of the forme (which gives the being of the thing) how is it an accident? for you say, *necessarily for having true baptisme, we must repeat washing into the name of the Father and of the Sonne and of the holy Ghost, which are but accidents.* And further you say, *a Turke so washed is not baptised.* How prove you this repeating of washing into the name of the Trinitie &c. and how doth the baptizing of a Turke prove this forme of washing to be an accident to the ceremony of baptisme? seing without this washing with water into the name of the Father &c. it cannot be baptisme.

And though this washing or ceremony in respect of the party baptised, may be called an accident (as all such formes of things are to the matter wherevpon they are induced) yet to baptisme it selfe, I meane, to the external ceremony it is no accident or adiunct, but is of the very essence and being thereof, and without which it cannot be baptisme. And therefore how you can call the washing with water into the name of the Trinitie an accident, I do not conceive, otherwife then as before, I have observed in respect of the party baptised, els might the ceremony of baptisme be for substance, without this washing with water into the name of the Trinitie. But whether it be of the essence, of baptisme or an accident, look with what warrant you do repeat it.

For suppose I should graunt as much as you desire, that this forme of washing into the name of the Trinitie were an accident to baptisme, yet the Lord having comaunded that accident to be but once vied without repeating, how can you iustifie the iterating of such accidentall truthe? as

you call them) for if it were of God in that baptism administered in P^{er}ry (as you confesse) then can you not repeat it: Therefore your iterating of it, argues you do not acknowledge it at all to be of the Lord: And so you retayne not the accidental truthes in baptism as you pretend to do.

U I. Argument.

AS God hath made an everlasting covenant with Abraham and his seed Gen. 17. 7. which through the malice of Satan and all his instruments shal never be cut of: So he preserved both in the Apostacy vnder the law & Gospel, the seals thereof for the comfort of the faithful. And therefore the Anabaptists in rejecting that baptism of Christ, whereof they were partakers, in the Apostate Church, and devising a new, do bring in a new covenant and a new Gospel taking vpon them to baptize themselves without al warrant from the word, for I am sure it cannot be shewed that any did ever baptise him selfe without special comāndement frō God, as Abraham had for circumcision. Gen. 17. 9. or Iohn for baptism. Mark. 1. 3. nor yet any others without ordinary or extraordinary calling. Ioh. 4. 2. Mar. 3. 6. Act. 8. 38. and 9. 18. and 10. 40. and 16. 33. If it be sayd the tymes be extraordinary, I answer, the Lord hath left cyther example or rule or ground of rule, whereby we may in extraordinary tymes, have a sure warrant out of the world to informe vs in every thing that we ought to do.

Mr Smyth.

I answer by an argument of like nature from Mar. 16. 18. framed thus, If the gates of Hell shal never prevail against the Church, then there hath alwayes bene a true Church, and antichrist could never make the Church false: and so you of the separation have sinned most shamefully in callinge the Church of antichrist false: verum primum. Ergo secundum.

First,

Rich. Clyfton

First I deny that your Argument is of like nature, neither wil your false relating of my words give you this advantage: for it is one thing to say, that God hath preserved the seales of his covenant, and an other to say, that these seales cannot be abolished through the malice of Sathan. I know the outward seales and other ordinances of God might have been abolished by the malice of Sathan, if the Lord would have permitted it. For as Antichrist, (Sathans instrument) hath perverted many of Gods ordinances to abolish them out of the church: As the worship, Ministerie, Government, Censures, &c. so hath he corrupted the word and Sacrament of baptisme: and if God had not otherwise disposed, could have foysted in a new forme of baptisme in the roome of it.

2. It is not the meaning of Christ in that place of Mark. 16, 18. that there should alwayes continue a true visible church upon the earth, which Antichrist could never be able to deface and corrupt: for the Scripture speaketh to the contrarie. But the promise of Christ to his church is this, that the gates of Hell shal not prevails against it, that is, against his people that by a lively fayth build upon the rock Christ: this promise the Lord performeth to everie true visible Church, so long as they cleave unto him & continue faythful, and to his invisible for ever: even in the very dayes of Apostasie, Sathan did not prevails against the elect of God. The Lord had some witnesses of his truth in al the tyme of Antichrist; as even Reuerius the Popes Inquisitor acknowledgeth, whose Testimonie is cyted by D. Fulke upon the Rev. 17. And albe it that there hath been alway a true church in a true understanding, yet doth it not follow, that that church from which we did separate, was that true church; or yet that this true church, was alwayes visible. But I come to your second answer which is more properly (as you say) *folded*.

That the covenant is sayd to be everlasting not in respect of the visible real existence in the world in an established church; but in respect of the stabilitie of it in regard of Sathans malice &c.

This answer of yours confirmeth my Argument and looseth it not: for I did not intend in saying, the Lord preserved or continued his covenant to his people against the malice of Sathan, that there was alwayes a true visible church walking in all the commandments of God, but this I mynded, and do say, that the covenant of God could never be cut off through the malice of Sathan.

Re.

† 27. bel.
3. 27. Re.
13. 11.
G. 11. 9.

Asse.

Rep.

Sathan, but continued firme to al the Lords people in all ages and times, yea through the great Apostasie of Antichrist. You say.

Ans. There was no true church in the depth of Antichristianisme, and so no true baptisme.

This consequent will not follow, for though the church of Antichrist was no true church: yet everie thing therein was not so: for the Scriptures (though by them abused) even in that Church were the true word of God, and so baptisme in like manner was Gods ordinance therein retayned, though corruptly administred.

I deny that the covenant, Church, or baptisme was visible alwayes.

Baptisme, which was appointed to be a seal of Gods covenant hath ever since the first institution of it, been visible, & that even in the deepest of Antichrists Apostasie. And the state of Apostate churches is not as the heathen, wher is no apparance of Christianitie, for in them remaines some kind of visibilitie of Gods ordinances eyther more or lesse, accordingly as they are more or lesse corrupted: For if all visibilitie should cease, they should cease to be called Apostate, and indeed become no churches.

And therefore as in man after his fall in Adam there remaines footstaps of that image of God, wherein he was first created: so in churches degenerate from the truth, remaines some remnants of Gods ordinances that were given to his church. The covenant is spoken of, and preached in those Apostate churches. And baptisme likewise administred, but not in that puritie and light, as they are in true churches. And as in the heavens, when the sunne is shadowed with clouds or mist, the proportion of it may be discovered in the mist or cloudes, & be perceived to be the sunne: So in the covenant of God and the seal thereof, wading through those foggie mysts of Popish errors, and Antichristian superstitions discerned & seen to be from heaven, of al the people of God, whose hearts the Lord opens to apply them aright. Which if it were not so, God could not have his people in Babylon, or church in the wilderness.

As you take upon you to set up a true church (as you say, but we say a false church) & will not be sayd to bring in a new covenant and a new Gospel &c. (for you in your self conceiveth will reiect them as Heretiques, if there be any that dare so say of you, forsooth) So the Anabaptists (as you call them) do not set up a new covenant and Gospel, though they set up a new or rather the old Apostolique baptisme which Antichrist had overthrowen.

To passe

To passe by the manner of your speeches which well might be amended: I answer, first, that for the setting up of churches, it is the Lords work and not ours, † who gathereth his sheep into his fold, and we obey him in calling us out of Babylon to joyne together to walk in his ordinances, who also inableth us hereunto, accepteth us to be his people, and * to be citizens with the Sainctes and household of God. Therefore it cannot properly be sayd of us that we sett up a church: but that God buyldeth us up to be his Temple. And being thus "gathered together in his name, we have the † promise of his presence, and are assured of our standing, and that we are a true visible church of Iesus Christ; (though it please you to call us a false church,) and doubt not to approve our calling against you and al our adversaries. And whereas you account it *self conceiptednes* in us to reject for Hereticks such as bring in damnable Heresies: it were good for them, whom we so reject to look into their estate, and not wilfully to abyde in their errors to their perdition.

For the Anabaptists, whom you say, *do not set up a new covenant and Gospel, though they set up a new baptisme.* What they do, both their writings and practise shewes: but howsoever they perswade themselves to retayne the old covenant and Gospel, yet is it not so; for whosoever receives not that Gospel and covenant that was preached and given to Abraham, and pretends to receive a Gospel or covenant, they receive a new covenant and Gospel. But the Anabaptists receive not the Gospel or Covenant preached to Abr. and yet pretends to receive a covenant. Therefore it is a new covenant and Gospel which they receive. For that Covenant which was given to Abraham, was given to him and to his seed, to the Iewes and their seeds: but the covenant which the Anabaptists plead for, is a covenant that should be made to the parents and not to their seed, & therefore is not the same, but a new and strange Gospel, never heard of in the dayes of Abraham.

Again that covenant that was given to Abraham was a sealed covenant to *him and to his natural seed: but that covenant which the Anabaptists wil enter into and receive, is an unsealed covenant, at least but sealed only to the parents and not to their seed: and so is not the same but a new Gospel.

In my former answer I sayd, that it can not be shewed that any man did ever baptise him self without special commandement from God, &c. and you thus replice. *I say, as much as you have to set up a true Church, wherein*

Ref.
† Ioh. 10.
* Eph. 2.
" Mat. 20.
† Mat. 20.
* Gen. 17.
The Anabaptists
to be a part
of the cove
nant, and
indeed
have no
outward
led cove
at al.

you answer not directly to the point, but shift it of, with saying, that you have as much power to set up baptisme, or baptise your selfe, as we to set up a Church: for suppose we have not this power to set vp a Church, then how is your action of baptising your selfe iustified? But how we have power, for that we have done, I have formerly shewed, viz. that we have power by the Lords commaundement to come out of babylon, to obey the truth reueiled vnto vs, and to ioine together in the fellowship of the Gospel, to walk in al the wayes of God. This is that we can do, and all that we do is by diuine commaundement, for if the Lord had not so inioyned vs, our coming together should haue bene but an assembly of our owne devise, and no Temple for the Lord. Now if you wil make your argument (which stands vpon comparifon) answerable, you must bring like warrant from the Scripture, that you being vn baptised, may baptise your selfe, or els that which we have done shalbe iustified to be of God, and your baptisme prove but a vayne fanisie. Further I desire it may be shewed, that baptisme, which is apart of the worke of the Ministry, can lawfully, and by warrant from God, be administred by any, but cyther by extraordinary authority, as by Iohn, Ananias, the Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists: or ordinary, as by Pastors and Teachers. Or that a person vn baptised without speciall commaundement from heaven (for ordinary rule there is none) may baptise himselfe, and having so done without any further calling to office, take vpon him to baptise others. And to do this, I would knowe, if it be not to presume above that which is written. For if you that baptise your self (being but an ordinary man) may this do, then may an other do the like and so every one baptise himselfe. You that stand so much for commaundement and example, shew vs cyther of these two if you can, or any sound reason out of the word? or els consider wel, if that you be not fallen into that, which you would condemne in others, viz. the practising of an v WARRANTABLE action, But you say.

A true Church cannot be erected without baptisme &c.

If this be so as you say, then cyther that baptisme which we receaved in the Antichristian assemblyes is baptisme, or els one that is no member of a Church may induce the forme (as you cal it) vpon Disciples, to make them a Church, and this haue we neyther commaundement nor example for. He that was the first Minister of baptisme stode then a member of the Church of the Iewes, & had also commaundement to baptise: but this

new doctrine teacheth that one that was never member of any Church shall baptise & make a Church, & that without comāndemet from God. Now you say a Church can not be erected without baptisme, because baptisme is the visible forme thereof, consider you; (that are so barren of proof for the admitting of Baptizing to your self, that you can not shew one good reason to warrant it to be lawfull) if by condemning & rejecting of that baptisme which you received in Antichristianisme, you overthrow not your new Church: for if a Church can not be without baptisme, and you not able to prove your new baptisme from the scriptures, which have rejected the old: Then is your assembly an idol: And so while you condemne other Churches vniustly, for false, yours proves more false then any.

But concerning baptisme, which you call the *visible forme of the Church*: I answer, 1. the forme of a Church is comon to all together. 2. If Baptisme be the forme, the it may come to passe, that one man may be a visible Church, as he that first in the company baptiseth himself, he is a Church being baptised, for he that hath the forme upō him, must needs be the thing formed, And so Mr Smyth was a Church, when he baptised himself, which is absurd to think.

But concerning the matter & forme of the Church, this you have written, *These * two or three faithfull people are the true matter of the true Church of the new Testament: and therefore have the true forme or covenant of the new Testament induced upon them.*

Againe, speaking of the exiled English Church at Amsterdam, you say, *that they have reduced the Church to the Apostolike constitution, which consisteth in 3. things, 1. the true matter, which are Saints onely. 2. The forme, which is the uniting of them together in the covenant. 3. the true propriety, which is communion in all the holy things.* Thus you contradict your self: here you teach us that uniting of people together in the covenant is the forme of the Church. And in this writing, that baptisme is the forme. Certainly the holy Ghost * distinguisheth baptisme both from the covenant and the body. But to contend about the forme of the Church, is here not to the purpose; seing both you and we graunt that a Church must consist of baptised persons, you contending for your new devised baptisme, we holding that baptisme which we have already received.

Further you reason for the erecting of your baptisme

That when all Christ visible ordinances are lost, either men must recover them again, or must let them alone, if they be let alone till extraordinary men come with miracles and tongues as the Apostles did, then men are **F A M I L I S T S.**

or if they must receive them, men must begin so to do. And then two men ioyned together may make a Church, (as you say) why may they not baptise, seeing they can not ioyn into Christ but by Baptisme. *Mat. 28. 19. compared with Mat. 18. 20 Gal. 3. 17.* But it is evident that all Christ's commandements must be obeyed. Ergo, this commandement, &c.

First for the visible ordinances of Christ, his Church hath right unto them, and his people are to have the use of them by such means and Ministry as he hath appointed: but every man may not take upon him the administration of these ordinances, but *they whom the Lord hath given authoritie and office thereunto. God is not the † author of confusion but of order. It wil not follow because the Church is to have baptism therefore any one may administer it when al are vn baptised. Thus might Ieroboam plead for the * Preists that he made of the lowest of the people, that it was a necessity seeing al the Priests of Levi were departed, and as at this day they plead in England for their vnpreaching Preists, that eyther they must have such, or be without service and Sacraments, which plea, as we condemne in them: so do we the administration of the Sacraments, or other of Gods ordinances without warrant from the Lord. And therefore they must be let alone til they may be had by that rule that Christ hath left vs for the injoying of the same.

For this I am sure of, that the word of the Lord is perfect, and CHRIST hath left vs certayne direction for the practising of al his ordinances at all tymes. Now if the Scripture have not shewed who shal baptise in the Churches arising out of Apostacy, then who dare take vpon him to give direction? And though we are not to loke for extraordinary men (which to do, say you, were *sumilisme*) yet must we loke for ordinary meanes: men must not do that which they are not warranted by the word, though the thing be to be done.

Secondly, for two being ioyned together in covenant with the Lord, to walk in his wayes, they have * warrant so to do (if there be no visible Church for them to ioyn unto) although I do not approve that every two or three shal ioyn together & so walk, when they may conveniently ioyn to a Church set already in the wayes of God; neyther may they attempt any thing beyod their measure & calling, least they fall into the sinne of Corah &c. And as for two baptising themselves or one an other, that can they not do without calling from God. And therefore you not having calling herevnto, & being as you say vn baptised, I pray you tel me how you are authorised by Christ herevnto, & conjoynd into his name?

The

rebaptizing of Elder people.

181

The Administration of Baptisme is by Christ † commaunded to his Apostles and Ministers of the word, as before is shewed.

As for your reason which is: *That els they can not comiour into Christ; but by baptisme.* I answer, we may be ioyned into Christ, by being vnted in one spirit into his covenant of life. And though persons that were never baptised, be received into the Church by baptisme, yet wil it not folow, that such as are baptised in apostare Churches ~~must~~ must any more be baptised, the they that being circūcised were recircūcised when they ioyned to the Church of the Jewes. And baptisme is not our grafting into Christ, but the signe or seale thereof, and so are those Scriptures which you alledge to be vnderstode. And as you say. *The commaundement of God must be obeyed, and so this commaundement.* It is true, being done according to the order and way that Christ hath appointed, & therefore you break the commaundement, to baptise your self & others without commission from Christ, & are guilty of that which he reproved in the Scribes & Pharisees, *who transgressed the commaundements of God by their traditions: so you do in this your new baptisme transgresse Gods commaundement, to magnifie your own devised practise. Look well to it, the Lord hath thus pronounced upon such transgressors, † *In vayne do they worship me, teaching doctrines mens precepts.* & the Psalmist sayth, *“cursed are they that do erre fro thy commaundments: the which iudgement of God you may behold in your selves (if God so open your eyes) who of one company, are now at least divided into 3. ech one refusing communion with other, & stil increasing in new errors.*

But for the baptizing of a mans selfe, you say,

There is as good warrant as for a man churching him self for two men singly are in Church joyntly they are a Church and they both of them put a Church upon themselves: So two men may put baptisme upon themselves.

This phraze of Churching a mans selfe, is not the phraze of the holy Scripture, it is the Lord that † calleth men out of the world & gathereth the together by his word, and buildeth them vp to be his Church as Christ sayth. *“other sheepe I have which are not of this fold, them also I must bring and they shall heare my voice.* And they whose hearts the Lord openeth, do willingly obey his voice, and beleeving, † walk together in his wayes as before I have observed. To passe by your strange phrazes, the scripture thus speaketh, that the Eunuch, Cornelius and others received baptisme administered

unto the by the Ministers of Chr. but that they or any other, did ever put baptisme, that is, (as I understand you) administer it upon themselves, I never read thereof in the scriptures: unlesse we should think that Iohn B. did it, who if it were so, had his calling extraordinarie from heaven.

Ans.

As two persons unchurched have power to assume the church, each of them for himself with others in communion: so each of the unbaptised have power to assume baptisme for himself with others in communion.

These things would do wel if they were proved. Concerning 2. persons or moe cōing into cōmuniō together, I have before set down what I think. And now for assuming of baptisme, if you mean therby receiving of it, (being lawfully administred) the I grant, that they which are unbaptised may & ought to receive baptisme in the cōmunion of the Saints. But that 2. persons or moe may take and baptise themselves or one another in your cōmunion, I abhorre as an humane invention. As for the exāples of Abr. and Iohn B. administring the Sacrament upon themselves, if so it were, yet serve nothing to your purpose: for Abrahā had a *special cōmandement to circumcise: so had Iohn for his "baptisme warrant frō God. But wil it follow because these 2. administred the Sacramēt upon themselves, therefore who list may consecrate his hands to that office? What is this els that you plead for, but to overthrow that order that Christ hath set down in his Church, to make every one a Minister of the Lords Sacraments, Cōcerning the Profelytes, that they did every one circūcise themselves; is not proved by that of Exo. 12. 48. for it is sayd there: *When a stranger shal dwel with thee & wil observe the passeover of the Lord, every male shal be circūcised unto him.* This scripture saith not that every one did circumcise himself, but that every male should be circumcised: Neyther if the Lord had sayd, as the Translation is, *let him circumcise al the males that belong unto him,* had this proved that al the Profelytes had done it themselves; for it is sayd of Iosua, that the Lord bad him make sharp knives, & return & circūcise the sons of Israel the second tyme. And yet wil any think that Iosuah did himself circumcise every uncircumcised male in Israel? or rather, that the Lord commanded him to see that it were done. And so that cōmandement given to Profelytes was, that they should cause al their males to be circumcised, or els they might not be admitted as members of the Church to eat the Paskeover.

But graunt that this was a special precept to the stranger to circumcise himself and his familie, the Lord laying this upon him, he had good warrant to

rant so to do: but seeing the Lord hath commanded the administration of baptisme to the Apostles and Ministers of the word, now it is to presume above that which is written, for any man to take upon himself, to administer baptisme to himself or to others: Neyther is this to follow the example of the Profelytes, if they had done as you alleadge: for then the Master onely and none els circumcised, and he circumcised but his familie. But this new opinion ittiablen any man, be he Master or servant to baptise himself, and also to baptise others that are not of his familie. Note wel how this example serves to your purpose.

Howbeit for circumcision, I take it, that it was administrated by the Levites after that they were called to office, because they were appointed in the roome of the first borne of Israel for the service of the Lord. And as I have heard, the Levites amongst the Jewes, do circumcise at this day.

But one thing more I would aske you, whether by two assuming baptisme in communion, you mean that two consenting together may the one baptise the other, at one and the same instant, or that one shall baptise the other first, and then he that is baptised, baptise him that was his baptiser, and what rule or warrant you have so to do? and do not with obscure termes seek to set a colour upon your errors to deceive the ignorant.

As concerning the administration of the Lords Supper, *to a mans self in communion with others, & prayer prophesying & praysing of God uttered for a mans self as well as for others, of every unclean person washing himself at the door of the Tabernacle going to sacrifice, of every master of a familie administering the paschever to himself & all his familie, the Priest daily sacrificing for himself & others.* All these proves not your desyre.

For as touching the administration of the Lords supper, it appertaines to the Ministers of Christ to do it & not to every man. And by vertue of their office they do administer, and as they are members of the church, they participate of those holy things with the rest of the brethren: And this is Gods ordinance: your case of baptising one another, is not alike: for there he administrereth the Sacrament that hath no calling, and he that is unbaptised himself, presumeth to set the seal upon himself or upon an other. Also in the Lords Supper al are agents according to their estate and nature of the action: but in the receiving of baptisme we are onely patients.

As for

Of the first Argument againe

As for praying, prophesying and praying of God, uttered for a man self as well as for others; this is Gods ordinance that men should pray & praise God for themselves and others, and is not onely a work of the ministerie, (save in publike) but a general duty apperteyning to * all the brethren; but the administration of baptisme, is appointed to the Ministerie. And there is great difference between our prayers and sacrifices offered to God, and the Lords Sacraments and word ministred unto us, the former we are commanded to doe our selves in our due place: the other is from the Lord unto us, and we are the subjects to receive the same by the administration of Gods Ministers, and al these things are the commandements of God.

Concerning those in the old Testament, that being unclean did purifie or wash themselves, they did thereby shew forth their continuall & voluntarie repentance and sayth to be cleansed from their pollutions and sinnes by Iesus Christ, Ioh. 13, 10. Neyther did they this without the Lords commandement. For were not the *purifyings of the unclean prescribed by Moses? shew us the like warrant for the new baptising of your selves, and the controversie is ended; and unlesse you do it, what do all these examples prove for you? seeing al these were done by warrant of the word, and you have no scripture to alleadge for your doings. And for the Priests washing themselves in the Laver, "God so commanded. But the Prophet (you say) *washing in the Laver at the door of the Tabernacle was a type of baptising the doore of the church.* would you then have us to think that every one coming to the Church: should baptise himself, yea & that also every tyme they come to publike worship? For if you hold thus, you might also thus reason from your similitude. But similitudes and allegories must not be pressed further then the intendement of them, & proportion of sayth will suffer. That washing, no doubt did signifie that such as come into Gods presence to offer any sacrifices, must be clean and holy: & the water in the Laver might wel be a type of the blood of Iesus Christ, & of regeneration in him, teaching that al the faithful (being made Priests unto God) should be washed from al their sinnes in the blood of Christ, and sanctified in him to the service of the Lord. And that therefore they should continually repent of their sinnes and have sayth in Iesus Christ, that so through him, they and their works & service, may be accepted of the Lord, and they in the end be received into his heavenly kingdome. But this will not justify your

your baptizing of your selves, for besides that which is answered before, the Priests were commanded to wash their hands & their feet themselves, for such use as is aforesayd. But in the new Testament we are appointed to be baptised by the Lords Ministers, as hath bene declared already. The same answer may be given to that of the Priests sacrificing for themselves, that they had the word for their warrant, and were first to offer for their owne finnes and then for the peoples. And this was an offering up to God: but baptism is the Lords ordinance to be administred to us, and therefore in this respect also, your reason is not alike.

Lastly, for that of every Master of a familie administring the Passeeover, the same is to be mynded, as in the former instances. And seeing they were altogether to eat of one food, (which shadowed out Iesus Christ and our Redemption by his death,) it lay upon the father of the family, not onely to do the things of ministracion parteyning to him, but to partake also himself of the same common food and banket with the rest. Moreover, although the master of the familie did so as then was appointed to be done by him: yet will it not follow that every man may now administer baptism to himself and others. The Master did that then for himself and his familie, by the commandement of the Lord, who was as a Bishop & a Priest in his owne howse, and besides him none in the howse might do it. But after that God had to his church by Moses given lawes and ordinances, and the Priests to do the service of the Lord: the * killing of the Passeeover was performed by the Levites and Priests: which teacheth us that it is not in every mans power to be a Minister of the Lords ordinaces, save they that have calling thereunto. And therefore I marveil that you will bring in so many instances so unfitting to your practise: all which examples might have taught you rather the unlawfulness of your action, than being al done by warrant, & yours without altogether.

Lastly, you say, *A man cannot baptise others into the Church himself being out of the church.* Then I pray you Sir, resolve me how you can baptise your self into the church being out of it, yea and where there was no church? or how you could baptise others, your self being out of the Church? or how two can baptise themselves to be a church that are unbaptised and without the church? And what conclusion is this to say, *A man can not baptise others into the Church himself being unbaptised: therefore it is lawfull for a man to baptise himself with others in communion?* If you have no better warrant for the

Exo. 12

4-10.

2 Chr. 35

17-33.

11.

practise of yourdoings, then these reasons which you have already alledged, youneed not, to boast of your Plerophory of your practise. But what is now become of your plerophory and full perswasion about it, seing you have already chaunged your mind again concerning your baptising of your self, & for this cause & other the like matters, are by some of your people excommunicate, .. It were good for you to remember and keep that saying of the Apostle, *It is good alwayes to be zealous in a good thing. Gal. 4. 18.*

Mr Smythes Reasons for Anabaptisme of Elders

people; Answered.

R. Clyfton

THUS having set down Reasons to prove that Apostates or Antichristians cōverted ar not to be rebaptised: let vs come to the examination of the reasons alledged to the contrary, the first whereof is this.

1. *Because Churches are to be constituted now after the defection of Antichrist, as they were first erected by the Apostles: but in the constitution of Churches the Apostles received in the members by baptisme. Ergo, so must we do now.*

Answer

The estate and constitution of people now, is not a like to the state of the Gentiles or Iewes in the Apostles tymes, they differ in divers respects. First the people then both of Iewes and Gentiles never had bene themselves, nor were ever of the posterity of those that had bene mēbers of the Church of Christ vnder the Gospel: seing then was the first planting of Evangelical Churches. But we are now the posterity of such parents as were members of the Church planted by the Apostles, els could we not have Apostated. 2. That people which the Apostles gathered

gathered into Churches were never baptised: And baptisme coming in steed of circumcision, and being a seale of our entering into Gods covenant; it was fit that they which beleaved and became the seed of Abraham should so enter into covenant they & their seed as he & his seed entered, that is, as he & his were received in by circumcision: so they & theirs should be received in by baptisme: Act. 2. 38. 41. & 8. 38. But we are a people that are already baptised, & the seed of them that were baptised, & had received the Gospel. And (although through Antichrists deceaveableness both we and they were raynted with many corruptions) yet had they or might have in that Apostasie, and so we also, so much faith, as thereby both we and they might become the people of God. Apoc. 18. 4.

And concerning the constitutiō of Churches, here it is to be noted, that the constitutiō of Churches set down by the Apostles was by the immediate directiō of the H. Ghost, And so serveth for a continual rule of establishing Churches to the end of the world: which forme or frame layed downe by them, no man hath power to alter or change. 1. Cor. 4. 14. 1. Tim. 6. 14. But the constituting of Churches now after the defection of Antichrist, may more properly be called a repaying, then a constituting of Churches, which through Apostacy have bene ruined; or a gathering together of the dispersed sheepe of Israell into such formes or shapes of visible Churches (the patterne whereof is shewed unto us in the word) For (as before hath bene noted) our state is not as theirs was that were the first constituted Churches: And so it wil not follow (as is alledged) that the receiving in of members into our Churches necessarily must be by baptisme, as in the primitive tyme it was: except onely of such persons as have not bene baptised before.

And herein I take it, lieth the deceit of this Argument that it putteth no difference between the people of God coming out

143
Mr Smythes first reason for
of Babylon, and them that came to the faith from amongst the
Gentiles, equalising Antichristianisme with Gentilisme, the one
being an apostate Church, the other no Church, the one partaker
of the word & sacraments (though with much corruptiō) the o-
ther partaker of neyther at all: the one professing Christ & teach-
ing many truthe of God, & so many as the elect thereby might
cōe to faith, Apo: 18. 4. The other neyther professing Christ, nor
teaching any truth of God, whereby any might be converted to
Christ, and become Gods people, in that estate of Gentilisme.

And thus having made playne the different estate of the first
planted Churches and ours in Apostacy, I answer. That
Churches now are to be constituted. (if repaying be not a fitter
speech) as in the Apostles tymes, & that all such as are received
in as members being vnbaptised, must be received in by baptisme:
but for such, as were baptised in Apostate Churches, their
repentance is sufficient without rebaptizatiō, as it was to the A-
postate Israelites, who vpon their repentance & returning to Je-
rusalem were received of the Church, without any new circum-
cission: And therefore to adde a second baptisme, with the A-
nabaptists, is to Apostate from Christ, and not to enter into his
covenant.

And in that the Apostles received in members by baptisme, they
could do no otherwise, seing the whole world was vnbaptised: but
if they had mett with any that before had bene baptised into the
name of Christ, as they that received the baptisme of Iohn, and as
we are, I make no question they did not: nor would not have
rebaptised them. And therefore the conclusion will not follow
that we are now to receive in by Baptisme, them that are already
baptised.

Mr Smyth.

And herein I hold the same point for baptising of infants; you are compelled to runne to the old
testament

Anabaptizing of elder people answered.

Testament, and from thence to fetch the chief corner stone of your building, out from the new Testament. So in this second point you utterly forsake the new Testament of Christ, &c. and set us againe to schoole to Moses, as if Christ had not been faithful enough to teach us his new Testament, but we must go learne the new Testament, of the old Testament, Christ of Moses, the Gospel of the law, &c.

Rich. Clifton.

Before you come to answer my exception against your reason, you pre-
fix as it were for a ground, certayn things which you intreat *us* and *all the*
Separation, especially the leaders, wel to weigh and ponder, and not to be ashamed to
learn of their inferiours. In which your great obieruation, I. you charge me
to be compelled to runne to the old Testament &c. What my answer is to this
your reason shalbe iustified. Now where you except about the former point
for baptizing of infants against my running to the old Testament to fetch my chief
corner stone, &c. If I have done evil herein, beare witness of it: but if
I have followed the example of Christ and his Apostles, who proved that
which they taught by the Scriptures of the old Testament, why impute you
this unto me to disgrace? search these *places quoted in the margent, and
see if the things of the new testament, were not proved out of the old. Yet
notwithstanding I have pled other reasons from the Scriptures of the new
Testament to prove the baptizing of infants, as in my answer is to be seen.
But my corner stone (as you please to call it) fetched from the old testament,
is so ponderous, as you can not remove it.

Concerning the forsaking of the new Testament, it is not I, but your self
Mr Smyth that sinns therein, by casting the children of beleevers out of the
covenant of salvation. And as touching the scriptures of Moses and
the Prophets, Christ himself set us to schoole to learne of them the things
that are written of him: and yet this you fault in me as if it were not lawfull
to prove doctrines and ordinances of the new Testament, out of Moses &
the Prophets. But I pray you Sir, that findes fault to be set againe to the
schoole to Moses, why say you, "*we must attayne to and learne all that, the Jewish*
Master of the old testament could teach us."

Do not you herein set us to school to Moses? But it seemes you are all Moses teaching. I would with you were not past Christs also, The old Testament is not so abrogated, that withal, the writings of Moses and of the Prophets, cease to be in force to teach us that live under the gospel. And if they be in force to teach, then are we to learne and to be taught by them.

As for Christ his saythfulnes in teaching us his new Testament, (which you think is diminished, if we labour to prove any of the ordinances thereof from the Scriptures of the old Testament) know you, that we hold Christ **to be saythful to him that hath appointed, even as Moses in al his house.* And yet no disparagement to him or the new Testament, (but rather an honour) to prove the parts and observances thereof, from Moses and the Prophets. For he that bad us *Search the scriptures*, did also himselfe to the two disciples that went to Emmaus, *"beginne at Moses and at all the Prophets and interpreted unto them in al the Scriptures the things which were written of him."* Which practise of Christ, as it doth teach us that we may learn Christ and the new Testament out of Moses and the Scriptures of the old Testament: so doth manifest his saythfulnes, that taught and fulfilled al that was prophesied of him, not imposing upon his church any new doctrine not heard of before. Baptisme under the Gospell is proved out of the old Testament, the Jewes did not think it strange to be at the coming of the Messiah, *John. 1. 25.* And Mr. Smyth sayth, that the Jewes baptismed were into the Messiah, to come in type. Ergo, our baptisme being the thing typed, must needs have warrant from the old Testament, and then it is no disgrace to goe to school to Moses to learn it.

And first I would know why we may not as wel with the Papiſts, fetch our high Priest from Moses, succession in the Ministerie from Moses, succession in the Church from Moses, as a succession in baptisme from Moses: and in effect you fetch a succession of the Church from Rome, for in fetching a succession of Baptisme from Rome, which is the forme of the church, yea and in fetching a succession of the matter of the church, which is the seed of the Parents baptised, you of necessity make the church of Rome a true Church.

First, for the Priesthood of Moses, the Ceremonies and such like ordinances of the church under the old Testament, they are removed by the coming of Iesus Christ, and therefore there cannot be any succession thereof under the Gospell, save in Christ: but of the everlasting cove-

nant

anabaptisme of Elder people answered.

ment made with Abraham, and sealed to him and his seed before the law was given, is no abrogation thereof.

There is an everlasting continuance (which you call a succession) not onely in the Church of the old Testament, but also under the Gospell as the Apostles do * witness, as also "a continuance of the sealing of the same. And therefore we must plead such a succession both of the covenant and sealing thereof from our father Abraham: seeing it is the same wherein we of the Gentiles are comprehended.

And this difference between this Covenant and the law and ordinances of the old Testament, if it please you to take notice of, will answer your question about succession. Yet I would not have you mistake me, for although I hold in this sense a continual succession of the people of God, partakers of this covenant of salvation, I affirme not that there hath been alway, and at all tymes known established churches, keeping soundly all the ordinances of Christ, and making visible profession thereof. In the Apostacie of Israel the Lord had his seven thousand that never bowed their knee to Baal, to whom this covenant belonged, and so had he in "antichristianisme.

Again, we fetch not a succession of Baptisme from Moses, otherwise then the Apostles have taught us. Col. 2. 10.-12. 1 Cor. 10. 1. 2. 1 Pet. 3. 20. 21. The sealing of the covenant was commanded to Abraham, and never repealed (save onely the outward signe changed, as before is sayd.) And as we fetch no otherwise succession from Moses or the old Testament, then hath been sayd: No more do we succession of the Ministerie, or of any other ordinance of Christ, but in like manner and upon the warrant. 2. Concerning fetching of succession of our church from Rome because of our Baptisme: I answer, 1. that Baptisme, as also the scriptures were given to the Church of Rome when she was a true church and the retayning them in her Apostasie, we receive them as Christe word and baptisme, though continued through her corrupt Ministerie and estate. 2. If (according to your terming) succession of Baptisme be meant, (being an ordinance of God,) yet will it not followe, that therefore we must receyve the whoredomes of the church of Rome (which we are comanded to separate from, Rev. 18. 4) because we receiv baptisme, but rather thus, as we have baptisme from Christ, so are we to have the constitution of our church, & what is polluted in eyther by Antichrist, to reject.

J. Ous

3. Our retaining of baptisme administered in the Apostate church, doth no more prove that we fetch succession of our church from Rome, then the Israelites, that were circumcised in the church of Ieroboam, returning to Ierusalem did fetch the succession of their church frō the Apostate church of Israel.

If it be objected that this people now separated from that Apostacy were matter of that false church: and so we fetch a succession of the matter of our church from a false church. I answer, that al such of Gods people that stand members of those Antichristian assemblies must be considered two wayes, 1. in respect of us and their outward standing, so are they members of those Assemblies: 2. in respect of the Lord and their election; so are they no members thereof; but the matter of Gods invisible church in tyme becoming visible. As on the contrarie in a visible church, al the people thereof in our account are held true members, yet t hypocrites in the Lords account, are no members or matter thereof. And as the Apostle sayth of Antichrists, *if they had been of us, they should have continued with us*: so I say of Gods people in Babilon, if they had been of that Antichristian church they should have continued with them, but by their coming out, it appeares that they are not of them, and therefore we cannot be sayd to have the matter of our church by succession frō Antichristianisme: but by the gracious work of God in his people of al ages, and (to use your word of Succession) as it were by a secret and hidden succession, even from the Apostles tymes. And thus it will not follow (as you say) that we make the church of Rome a true church.

If Infants of the church of Rome have true tytle to Baptisme, by reason of the sayth of some of their Ancestors that were sayntful, then are they the true matter of the visible church, &c.

We do not say that the Infants of the church of Rome, have tytle to Baptisme by reason of their Ancestors sayth, but do asserme that in respect of that Apostatical standing, neither infants nor their parents have right to any of Gods ordinances: neither is it inough that people be elected, and thereby to have right to Gods covenant &c. before God: but to be members of the visible church and partakers of the holy things, there must be a visible going out of Babylon: *for what agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols*, the vessels of the Lord must be caried out to Ierusalem, & then are they in their due place, and shal have their true use, which in their Romish

standing they could not have; albeit in Babylon they were the vessels of the Lord. And herein are you deceived, that if any of the ordinances of God be reteyned in the hands of Antichristians, these ordinances must eyther make them a true visible Church, or be none of his, and when they are brought out thence have no vse.

These things may also answer that which follows: For upon this that we deny Baptisme administred in Poperie to be iterated, you would conclude these absurdities to follow. viz.

That infants of the Church of Rome are a true visible Church in the cōstitutiō & essential causes therof: That the Church in the new testamēt cometh by successiō of carnal genealogie through the church of Rome to our dayes. That the matter of the church, viz. infants descending of baptised parents is by genealogie, & the form of the Church, viz. baptism upon those infants is by descent, and therefore the Church is by succession. I demand, why may not the Ministerie be by succession as wel as the Church, and England and Rome true Churches, their Ministerie true, &c.

Repl.

To all which particulars, I answer thus, 1. Infants may be members of a visible Church, but that a visible Church can stand of infants onely, we deny. 2. Neyther Infants nor the elder sort standing in Antichristianism, can be the matter of a true visible Church, being so looked vpon according to that estate and respect. 3. Baptisme (which you would have the form) hath his true use in the visible Church of Christ, and to Gods people. 4. let the people of God in Babylon and the Baptisme that there they receive, be compared with Gods people in the apostate Church of Israel, & with their circumcision: And it will appeare that the infants of the Church of Rome are not a true visible Church, in the essential causes therof, any more or otherwise, then as they were in Israel. Concerning the Churches successiō by carnal genealogie, I answer, that as the covenant was made with Abraham and his seed; so vnder the Gospell, doth the promise belong to the parents & their childre. And that God had his people in all the tymes of Poperie that were within his covenant: Neyther is this to hold succession of visible Churches, but (to vse your terme) a succession of true beleevers in all ages, though not alwayes known in publick, it being the lot of the Church to be persecuted by the Dragon and driven to flee into the wilderness, for a time, times, & half a time. And therefore seeing the matter of the visible Church is not alwayes, nor otherwise seen to descend from baptised persons by genealogie, then as it did from parents circumcised in Israel, there can

Ans.

“Apoc.
14. &
4.
† Rev.
13. 14.

Bb

bs

be no other succession visible of the Church, or Ministerie, then is incident
 to such estate, but as in Israel there was * a breaking off, of both : so hath
 it fallen out under the new Testament, a † surreasing of succession of true
 visible Churches and of the true Ministerie in the apostasie of Antichrist.
 And this may satisfie you why we may not returne back againe to churches
 continuing in Apostasie.

But where you say, you hear some are mynded to take up their former ministerie
 and returne back againe into England. You should have done wel, eyther to
 have forewarned such, (if you knew in them a purpose to sinne) els not so
 easily to have received the report thereof to make it publike, and so to
 cause suspition to arise against any brother undeservedly. For myne own
 part, I know none of the church to have any such thoughts. If any that
 have left the fayth, as you have done, and departed from the church, or
 for their sinne justly cast out, so do purpose, what is that to us? look to it
 your selves.

And truly for my part, I hold it as lawfull to retayne the church and Ministerie
 of England, as to retayne the baptisme, and when I shal yeeld to the truth of the baptis-
 me of England, I wil yeeld to the truth of the Church & Ministerie of England &c.

It may be you speake truer of your estate, then you think. But whatsoever
 your perswasion is, I mynd a difference to be put between baptisme
 administred in churches standing in Apostasie, and the constitution and
 ministerie of these churches: For baptisme being the ordinance of God,
 may not be repeated, as before is proved: but those Assemblies that consist
 of confused multitudes and are not set in the wayes of God, that have
 a false Ministerie and worship, we have a speciall commandement * to se-
 parate from, as we have from al corruptions of Gods ordinances: but in
 no scripture to reject the ordinances themselves for any pollution that is
 upon them.

Now it is further to be remembred, that we in retayning baptisme, do
 not retayn the corruptions wherewith it was administred, but that which
 is of God therein: Neyther do we hold it lawfull for them that are come
 out of Babylon, to returne thither to fetch Baptisme. And to make this
 difference to appeare more playnly, Let be considered the example of those
 Israelites that returned to Ierusalem, who cast not of their circumci-
 sion, yet might they not iustify for true, that apostate Church or Mini-
 stery from which they did separate, or continue in the communion thereof
 without sinne.

But because I know the Ministerie and Church of England is false, therefore it

Anabaptising of elder people, answered.

must needs be, that Baptisme, which is the forme of the Church essentially, &c.

For the Ministerie of the Church of England, whether it be true or false, is not the thing controverted between you and me: but that baptisme in an apostate Church is false essentially I deny, and your self confesse^t that if it be administred by Antichrist to such as confesse their faith and sinnes, it were true and not to be repeated: which opinion of yours can not stand, if the essence of baptisme be destroyed. For your wish, *that the Lord would open all our eyes of the separation to see and our hearts to understand, that all the old Testament was carnal, to type out & to teach them heavenly things: & therefore their Church was carnal to type to us the new Testament, &c.* It hath pleased God, (and we are thankful for it) to open our eyes to discern of your carnal doctrine, & to understand the truth, which you labor to obscure by your strange expositions. As for the old Test. which you call carnal, & the church carnal: I tell you agayn and againe, that all the ordinances under the old testament, were spiritual in their ordination and right use, as the [†]law it self is holy & spiritual, and therefore are called "ordinances of religion; and the Tabernacle, *Mikdash*, to teach that it was of an holy use for the Lord. The old Church also was a spiritual house, notwithstanding, that the first testament had ordinances of religion which did shadow forth things to come, for in substance both it, and the Church under the Gospel are * the same, onely differing in the outward administration of the covenant. To the former Church holy things were administred, under types and figures: to the latter more simply and in the playn manifestation of the truth. Now to prove your carnal and typical Church, you say:

The matter of the old Church, was a carnal Israelite, and the forme, carnal circumcision a carnal seal. Gen. 17. 10-14. But the matter of the Church of the new Testament is a true Israelite, the forme is the circumcision of the heart, a new creature, the holy spirit of promise, whereby we are sealed, which is manifested by confession & baptism in water. Act. 10. 47. Ephe. 1. 13. Gal. 3. 27. & 6. 15. 10. 3. 5. Mu. 3. 6. Ro. 10. 9. Act. 2. 36. 37. &c.

Concerning your carnal matter and forme I have answered, pag. 12. and have also proved that God did require of that his people Israel to be tholy and "spiritual. And for the forme of the old Church, I have shewed likewise that they became * a Church & people of God, by vertue of Gods covenant made with them, wherevnto circumcision was added as a seal to confirm the same; which they also received, pag. 12. 13. 19. &c. The form of the Church can never be wanting, the Church continuing to be a Church: but circumcision may be wanting, and was wanting to all the Israelites, when in the wilderness by all that space of 40. yeres, and yet I hope they were members of his "Church all that time notwithstanding.

That which you set downe for the forme of the new testament, viz. *Circumcision of the heart, a new creature and the spirit of Christ*, is internal, proper to every true member both of the old Church and new: yea this forme (if it be so called) belongs to Gods people in Babylon and to all the members of the invisible Church: but that outward forme of a visible Church, which we are to know it by, must be visible, and such as we can discern them to be a people of God from all other assemblies. But this new creature and inward graces, you will say *are manifested by confession and baptism in water*: so may it also, where baptism is not had as it might be in Israel when they could not have circumcision. Also the forme of the Church, must be one indivisible thing common to the whole, that gives the being thereof, as before I have observed: but confession and baptism as it is particularly applyed to every member, as to the * Eunuch, Paul &c. so may it rest in one man, if all the rest should dye or fall away, who could not be a Church, and yet he hath that, which you set down to be the forme of the Church. Wherefore Gods people ioyned together in the fellowship of the Gospel, must have one general form, where by they receive the denomination of a Church, & that is their solemn entering into communion vnder the covenant of the Lord uniting together, to walk in all his wayes & to be his people, which all that are afterward added to the Church must promise to observe. And such a communion do we hold for a Church (& so "did you") For as many stones may be hewed & squared, & so be fit matter for an house, yet have not those stones the denomination of an house, until they be ioyned together in one forme: No more people confessing Christ, are to be held a visible Church until they be ioyned together in such a forme, as Christ hath commaunded. But to follow you in your comparison of these two Churches, speaking of the Jewes thus you say. *Their carnall Church in the matter and forme, came by carnall genealogie, and so they all of them were gendered unto bondage vnder the rudiments of the world, Gal. 4. 24. -- 25. vnder the carnal Testament. Our Church in the matter & forme thereof is by spirituall generation, that is the genealogie of the faithful, of Abraham the father of vs all. Gal. 3. 7. 9. 14. Ro. 4. 10. 11. Their parents in that carnal Church, was carnal Abraham, and carnal Agar, &c. our spirituall parent is Abraham spirituall &c. Their Ministry was a carnal Ministry by carnal genealogie &c.*

First I deny that eyther the matter or forme of the Church of the Jewes came by carnal genealogie, as you apply it: They were made a Church and people of God through the everlasting covenant which God made with

with Abraham and his seed, els could not the Profelyts and their children have bene matter of that old Church, seing they descended not by carnall genealogie from Abraham. Agayne, that Church must be of the same nature with the covenant which gives the being thereof, but this † covenant is spirituall: Ergo the Church also is spirituall.

That place of Gal. 4. 24. 25. which you cite to prove that old Church to be carnal, you misaply, as before I have shewed, pag. 14. Secondly I deny that Hagar was the mother of the Israelites after the flesh, though Abraham was their father, neyther was Imael the type of the Israelits as they were by nature the seede of Abraham, but of such Israelits and others vnder the Gospel, that by the works of the law sought to be iustified, whereby they came in bondage to the law as the Apostle witnesseth. See the exposition of Gal. 4. 24. 25. in pag. 14.

As for the spirituall genealogy, both vnder the law and the Gospel, I do approve to be the true seede of Abraham, but not in your sense, that excludes the infants of the faithful from the covenant, which of vs are to be * accounted the children thereof, as wel as these that outwardly profess their faith.

And concerning the Ministerie of the old Church, although none could be Preists † but of the line of Aaron, yet was the " tribe of Levi chosen by God himself for that office. And God * sanctified them to the service of his name, and to the Ministry of holy things.

Lastly, you charge vs, with an introducing of a carnal line into the Church, to be baptised, & by succession fetch baptism upon the carnal line through the Church of Rome, &c.

Of this I have spoken before, and I answer further. 1. that we do not introduce any other carnall line into the Church to be baptised, then the Lord himself introduceth, that is, the children of the faithful. And this is not (as you say) to set up Iudaisme in the new Testament, seing all the people of God, of al nations and ages are bound vnto it: for we know no other covenant, by which we become the People & Church of God, but that same, which was made with Abraham and his seed.

Concerning the carnall lyne (as you cal it) though in respect of vs it may seeme to stop in Apostacy, yet the Lord continueth his promise to his elect therein. Neyther by this our retayning of baptism do we iustify Rome to

Bb 3

be a true church, nor make our selves Schismaticks: seeing we cast of her adulteries, and keep that which is Christs ordinance, by her polluted. Also you charge us, *To be fallen from Christ, and become a new second image of the beast never heard of before in the world.* For being fallen from Christ look that it be not your owne case. Of the image of the beast I† read, but not of a new second image, and therefore no marveil though it be never heard of in the world. (as you say) and if it had been by you unspoken of also, by so applying of it unto us, your sinne had been the lesse. And thus much in answer to your premised ground. Next you set down the summe of my exception.

First I say, that the new Testament is as sufficient for the direction of al the affaires and occasions that besel in our tyme in the new Testament, as the old Testament was for the occurrents that besel under the old Testament, seeing Christ is as saythful as Moses, and the new Testament as perfect as the old. Gal. 3. 15. and therefore if the Lord had intended to put a difference betwixt the Apostolike constituting of Churches and our constituting of them, in respect of the persons to be admitted into the church, and in respect of baptising, and not baptising, or rebaptising of them, he could & would have done it. &c.

The sufficiencie of the new Testament we acknowledge, & of the books thereof for that use wherefore they were written. But it seemes that you confound the new Testament or covenant of grace with the books thereof: for you reason thus, that the new Testament (meaning the bookes thereof) are sufficient for direction of al affaires of the church. And your prooffe out of Gal. 3. 15. is of the covenant it self, and not of the bookes thereof. And afterward you alleadge as a reason for the same end, *that the new Testament is perfect and sealed with the blood of Christ*, thus deceiving the Readers with an homonymy of the word Testament.

The bookes of the new Testament were al unwritten when Christ suffered and had sealed the covenant of Grace. This Testament had been perfect, if there had been never a book written. The historie of the Gospel was written* that we might beleeve that Iesus is the Christ promised and foretold in the holy Scriptures of the Prophets, and that beleeving in him we might have eternal life.

Concerning the saythfulnes of Christ, it consisteth in“ fulfilling of those things which Moses and the Prophets had sayd should come to passe. And if he give us direction for all the affaires and occasions that fall out in our

tymes,

tymes, eyther out of the books of the new Testament or old, we ought to be thankful to God, and accordingly to use them, and not bynd him, or our selves, onely to the writings of the Apostles: Seeing Christ is the Author as wel of the doctrine & writings of the Prophets, as of the Apostles. 2 Tim. 3. 16, 17. 1 Pet. 3. 18, 19.

Againe, concerning the difference between the Apostolicke constituting of Churches and ours, which you charge us with: I answer, we plead for no difference, neyther do we practise contrarie to the first planting of the church (witness Mr. Smyth. *Differences*, in the preface lin. 12.) for as then such as were to be received into the Church, did confesse their sayth, and so with thir families were baptised, so wee hold, that all such that are unbaptised, and to be added to the church: must enter there-into they with their families, after the same manner, as in the Apostles tymes.

And we do acknowledge that all churches which have Apostated, are to be reformed according to the patterne and platforme layd downe by the Holy Ghost in the Scriptures. But this difference we put between persons that were never baptised, and such as have received baptism in an Apostate church: affirming that the former are to be adjoynd to the Church by baptism, the latter not to be againe baptised: which if it had been necessarie, the Lord no doubt would have commanded, when he bad his people to goe out of Babylon. But seing he sayth not a word of the renewing thereof, we are to content our selves, and to practise as the Holy Ghost selfe where doth teach us, by the example of the Israelites in an other like case. Now if you can shew us eyther commandement or example or any good reason in all the new Testament, to rebaptise them which have been baptised in Apostate churches, we will receive it and practise it: if not, why do you plead for it, & without warrant do rebaptise your selves, & also affirme so confidently, that all things be so manifest in the APOSTLES writings, that upon every occasion that fallles out in our tymes, we have direction for it.

Lastly, it is not wee that adde to this new Testament (as you charge us) or that bring in a new CHRIST, a new Church, a new Covenant, a new Gospell, and a new Baptisme: but you your selves are guilty of this sinne, for you by your new devysed baptism, have rejected the seal of GODS Covenant, and consequently the covenant it self, and so the Author of it.

And as IEROBOAM
forged

† 2 Chr.
5-13.

12. forged the eight moneth out of his owne hart , for to keep a feast unto the Lord: so have you forged a church of your own invention, and the receiving in of members into it. And that which you would impute unto us, is fallen upon your selves, even that * woe for adding to the word.

22. Secondly, I affirme that (as the holy Ghost sayth) the Antichristians are in condition equal to Pagans, not called Israelites or Samaritanes, but Babylonians, Egyptians, Sodomites, Gentiles: But the holy Ghost knoweth what and how to speak: And therefore as the Babylonians, Egyptians, Sodomites and Gentiles washings were nothing, no more is the Baptisme of Antichristians any thing. &c.

I have Answered to this before pag. 150. 151. And shewed that the Jewes, which were called the people of "Gomorrah, and their Rulers the Princes of Sodome, should then stand in the same estate with Pagans, and in condition be equal unto them, and their circumcision voyd, if the holy Ghost, in so terming them, did maynd as you doe. This is a strange kind of reasoning, that because the Antichristians resemble the Gentiles in some filthy practises, for the which the spirit calls them Sodomites, &c. therefore their condition in al respects, is as theirs. Christ called Peter Sathan, shal we thereupon conclude, that therefore Peter was as Sathan in al respects, because in his counselling his master to favour himself, he was like him? Of Iudah it is sayd, that she was more corrupt in al her wayes, then Samaria and Sodome, shal we say (because the Lord thus speaketh) that Iudah was now to be recircumcised? If the holy Ghost calling the Antichristians Sodomites &c. should teach us thereby, that he esteemeth no otherwise of the church and Baptisme, then of the Synagogues of Babylon, the washings of Egypt, then of the worship of Sodome and the Pagans (as you say) then must he needs teach us, the like to esteeme of the churches of the Jewes, and of the circumcision; when he calls them the people of Gomorrah, and more corrupt in her wayes then Sodome, as before I have observed.

For your comparison of the Gentiles washings, with the baptisme of Antichristians, affirming, that as the former were nothing, no more is the other. This is not to compare things alike: for the washings of the Gentiles were of mans invention, and baptisme is the ordinance of Christ. And therefore it wil not follow, that because mens devises are nothing, when any of the turne to God; that baptisme also (Gods ordinance prophaned in Popery) is therefore nothing, when any such Apostates repent and returne to God.

on. No more is this a good reason to prove that the Holy Ghost did foresee, that the Antichristians would abolish true baptism, by baptising Infants, because he calleth persons Apostating, Babylonians, Sodomites, Gentiles.

Thirdly, Whereas you say that *reparing* the Church now after the Apostasie of Antichrist is a fitter speech, then constituting, herein do you both tax your selves of the use of that word, constitution, and plainly signifie that you incline to maintain the Churches of England or Rome to be true churches, wherein whether you do not forsake your first sayth, and turne with the dogge to the vomite, look you upon it. &c.

If it had pleased you to have taken my whole answer, you had neither cause to have excepted against the word, *reparing*, nor yet have gathered thereby any inclination in us, to maintayn any thing that is corrupt eyther in the churches of England or Rome, much lesse (as you say) to forsake our first sayth, and turne with the dogge to the vomite. But you that thus speak, it were good to take heed, you be not the dogge that vomits out your blasphemous errors, to the dishonour of God and offence of his people. If the word of *reparing*, had been so faulty, you had done better to have manifested the untrutes thereof, then to have bewrayed your evil thoughts in the unjust censuring of others.

But concerning *reparing* or *reforming*, let the indifferent Reader judge, if it be not more proper to us, then to constitute or plant, for who knoweth not that there is but one constitution or planting of the church under the Gospel, which is founded by the Apostles. And other forme or frame can no earthly power devise then that which the Apostles have left us. And seeing at the first they did constitute churches in divers partes of the world, and those churches ruinated by Antichrist: shal not the restoring of them to the first patterne of the Apostles, be properly called a repairing? seeing they did not cease utterly to be no churches, but are churches in corruption or ruine. But I will not contend about words, for that which I strive for, is, to have the church in that forme as the word prescribeth, both for people, worship, government, and what els appertayneth thereto.

Fourthly, I say that the Jewes that were converted to the faith of new Testament, of Christ, by Christ, John and the Apostles in your account, were in a farre better estate then Antichristians for they, as you say, were of the same body with the church of the new Testament, and their circumcision was a shadow of the new Testament, as you say, and they were in Christ Jesus, as you say, and were washed. I doubt not many of

them into the Messiah &c. and why might not they by Iohn, Christ, or his Apostles be admitted into the church without baptism: If therefore Christ, Iohn and the Apostles would needs baptise them, and so by baptism constitute them into the new Testament, that had al these prerogatives in your indgement: much more wil they have us to constitute Antichristians converted into the true church by baptism.

This your reason is alike the rest, nothing good, for albeit that the Church of the Jewes was a true church, yet had it not Christ exhibited in the flesh afore this tyme, wherefore it was meet, seeing the Priesthood and ceremonial administration of that Church was changed, and the fold was to cease, that the Jewes, as well as the Gentiles should be partakers thereof alike; that thereby they might acknowledge Christ their Messiah to be come, who they looked for. And as it was required of the members of the old Church, that they should * beleve in the Messiah to come: So was sayth " required of them that should be admitted into the church of the Gospell, wherein both Jewes & Gentiles should be alike received & baptised into his name.

As for the Apostate church of Antichrist, it is such a one as acknowledgeth Iesus Christ to be come, & professeth the Gospell, though corruptly. And baptism received in the Apostate church hath his use unto such as repenting, turne to the true church of Christ, because baptism is an ordinance of the new Testament, appointed by the Lord himself. And though the beleiving Jewes were in Christ members of his mysticall body, and their circumcision a seal of the righteousnes of their sayth, yet was their sayth in † Christ to come: and circumcision did seal up unto them Christ to come. And therefore al this being but by sayth in the Messiah to come, it was necessarie, that they should also receive him now being come, and be baptised into his name, if they would continue members in his body. And so this may answer you, why Iohn, Christ, and his disciples did not admit the Jewes, as members of the church of the Gospell without confession of sayth in CHRIST now come, and Baptisme in his name. And yet we may receive into our Church, them that have been baptised in the Apostate Churches without iterating of baptism, upon the confession of their sayth and repentance. Neither is this, to offer indignitie to the LORDS ordinances in the old TESTAMENT, (as you do seeme to charge us) for wee honour them in their place, and right use, as the Lord then appointed them, and your self, I suppose wil not say, that you offer indignitie to those ordinances

finances of the Lord although you acknowledg that baptisme received in Popery, is not be to repeated, being administred to such as are of yeares, upon their owne profession of fayth.

Agayne Ch. 7 deny that ever the English nation or any one of our predecessors were of the fayth of Christ, shew it if you can, but we came of a Pagan race, til Rome the mother came and put upon vs her filse baptisme. And therefore though the Romanes might plead this, yet England cannot plead it, and so your dissimilitude cannot hold in that thing, and our case simply Paganisme.

If al this were graunted that you say, yet is the state of England in as good case as Rome, seing she by your own confession hath Rome for her mother, and as the mother so is her Daughter. If England partake with Rome in her Apostacy and whoredomes, she must nedes be a member of her. But I pray you Sir, wil you admit of that baptisme in Rome without new baptizing of such as shal come from thence? if you do, you overthrow your owne position, viz. That Antichristians converted are to be admitted into the true Church by baptisme. And if you doe not, why put you this dissimilitude betweene England and Rome which serves not to the question in hand?

But you desyre me to shew if I can, that the English nation or any one of our predecessors were of the fayth of Christ: it may be I cannot shew, that any of them were Anabaptists before you, which you falsly call the fayth of Christ but I can shew to them that wil heare, that our English nation received the fayth before Rome fet into this Apostacy.

First, Gildas affirmeth* that Britayne received the Gospel in the tyme of Tiberius the Emperour under whome Christ suffered. And then was not Rome apostate. And further he sayth; That Ioseph of Arimathea after the dispersion of the Jewes, was sent of Philip the Apostle from France to Britayne, about the yeare of our Lord, 63. And remayned in Britayne all his tyme, who with his followers layed the first foundation of Christian faith among the Britayne people. Tertullian testifieth how the Gospel was dispersed abroad by the sound of the Apostles, & there reckoneth up the Medes, Persians, Parthians and dwellers in Mesopotamia, Syria, Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, Phrygia, Egypt, Pamphilia with many more, as length commeth to the coast of the Morians and all the borders of Spaine, with divers nations of France: And there amongst others he reciteth all the parts of Britayne, and reporteth the same to be subiect to Christ.

And

Re

Ans.

† Eccle

44

* A. B.

Mon

Book 2

91

Gildas

de vi

Aurel

Ambr

Rom

† Ter

con. Ind

And also reckoneth vp the places of Sarmatia, of the Danes, the Germans & Schythians with many other Provinces and Isles: in all which places, sayth he, reigneth the name of Christ, which now beginneth to be common. 3. †Origine sayth, that

Origin. Britayne did consent to Christian religion. 4. * Nicephorus, saith, That Symon Zelotes did spread the gospel of Christ to the West Ocean, and brought the same into the Isles of Briuayne. 5. In the time of the Abbot of Cluniake, the Scots

did celebrate their Easter, not after the Romane maner, but after the Greeks, as he testifieth to Barnard. Which argueth that they had received the faith, and not from Rome. 6. Also it appeareth by a letter of E-lutherius Bishop of Rome written to Lucius King of Britayne, anno 169, that Lucius had received the faith of Christ in his Land, before he sent to E-lutherius for the Romane lawes: for so do the words of the letter purport, which are these:

Ye have received of late through Gods mercie in the Realme of Britayne, the law and faith of Christ: you have with you within the Realme both the parties of the scriptures,

out of them by Gods grace take ye a law, and by that law, through Gods sufferance rule your kingdome of Britayne, &c. And thus was fulfilled in Britayne as well as in other lands the words of the Prophet, who sayth, "he shall not feyلة nor be discouraged, (speaking of Christ) til he hath set iudgement in the earth, and the flou shall waite for his law. And it is also further written of this King Lucius, that he did not cōpel the heathen, but imbraced such as by the word were converted. Which is to be observed concerning the constitution of the Churches then. For it is sayd, *that he founded many Churches, and gave great riches and liberties to the same.* And because of this imbracing of the faith, it caused those great troubles that fel out between the Britaynes which were Christians professing the faith, and the infidels, who brought in the Romanes which exercised much crueltie amongst the Christians. In Dioclesians tyme the Churches of Britayne were grievously persecuted & many suffered for the faith of Christ, as *Albanus, Iulius, Aaron, Amphibulus & many more.*

And thus if it please you to take notice from these writers, you may see that this English nation were of such as professed the faith of Christ and not of a Pagan race, til Rome came and put vppon vs false baptisme, as as you say, neyther that our case is simply paganisme, if these things be thus, as is aforesayd.

Next whereas I sayd that repentance of such as were baptised in Apostate Churches

rebaptizing of Elder people, as before.

Churches was sufficient without rebaptization for their admittance into the church &c. You answer. *That the Churches of Antichrist were false, and the church of the Israelites was not false. The churches of Antichrist were false, because they consisted of the carnal seed baptised, which was not that one seed, unto the which the promise was made. that is the faithful.* &c.

I have shewed before how well you agree with your self concerning the church of Israel, which here you say was not false, and yet have published to the contrarie.

As for your grounds or reasons of the trunes of the Israelitish church, and fallenes of Antichrists, whatsoever you can plead for the one, the like may be alledged for the other. If Israel in her defection be accounted a true church: then must Rome also in her Apostasie.

Certain it is, that both are to be esteemed Apostatical Churches, and this is that which we testifie. And touching Israel, if the carnall circumcision alone of the Israelites, had ben the sufficient constitution of that church, to keep it free from being Apostate, they continuing it; why should the Lord bidde tel her, † that she was not his wife, nor he her husband. Or did the * Priests and Levites well to leave their suburbs and possessions, to leave that church to goe to Iuda and Ierusalem? but hereof before.

2. For the matter of the Antichristian churches, which you say was false, because they consisted of the carnal seed baptised. I answer, that they were not therefore false or Apostatical, because infants were baptised (whose baptism is proved lawful already) but for that they brake covenant with God, forsoke their first love (as now you do) and followed strange lovers, shed the blood of the Saints, were a cage of every unclean and hateful bird, &c. and these are the sinnes which they are charged with, but never is it imputed to them for sinne, their baptising of Infants.

Wherefore an Edomite or Ismaelite coming to be a proselyte of the Iewes Church that had omitted circumcision, is a true president of the Antichristian Apostasie. &c.

This is against your self, for if they were uncircumcised, they ought to be received into the Iewes Church by circumcision: And so if any be unbaptised, they ought now to be received into the ch. by baptism. But tel me if an Edomite or Ismaelite having circumcision & becoming a proselyte, was recircumcised? Now if the Edomites & Ismaelites turning to the faith, either were uncircumcised, or being before circumcised were not recircumcised, what is this to the purpose, to prove that Antichristians must be rebaptised?

You adde also, *so I take it the Profelytes were types of Antichristians concerned in the fayth and admitted into the true church.* Why say you not rather, the Profelytes were types of the Gentiles, that under the Gospel are converted to the fayth, and admitted into the true church? As for their being types of Antichristians, you know there is a great difference, seeing the Profelytes were uncircumcised afore their conversion, but the Antichrists are baptised already. But if this be your thought that Profelytes, & their entrance into the Iewish Church were types of Antichristians converted and admitted into the true Church, then I trust you wil, that the thing typed be answerable to the type: But you know, when a Gentile or Edomite was converted to the profession of the Iewes, and became a profelyte, he was received into the church of the old Testament wvith his familie, and *sal his males must be circumcised, as vvel as himself.* Why admit you not that the Profelytes of Antichristianisme (as you call them) should enter into the church with their children, according to the type propounded by your self.

Moreover, whereas you say, that if the Apostles had met wvith such as we are, they would have received us into the Church without baptisme. I answer, if such an example had been left us, we would then have rested satisfied: but seeing the Apostles have left no such example or precept, therefore you are stil in your Apostasie & having not repented of, nor forsaken your Egyptian baptisme, are still unseparated, do still retainne the mark of the beast, and are subject to the woe that the Angel threatneth to persons so marked.

Example is left of such as vvere circumcised in the Apostasie of Israel, & were not circumcised againe when they came to the church of Iudah, and this is written for our learning. Rô. 15, 4. That baptisme is but once, & not to be iterated, the scripture teacheth no precept nor example for rebaptising. And therefore we may not forsake our baptisme (howsoever you call or esteem it) seeing we know it is not to be repeated, but upon our repentance it sealeth unto us the covenant of salvation, & is effectual for the confirming of our fayth.

As for Apostacy, whether we stand therein or no, let it be tryed by the word, we know you an unequal iudge, that hath apostated from the fayth. And for the marke of the beast, and the woe that followes, we know it is due to them to whom it belongs. And if this marke were the baptising of infants, as you say it is, then the Angel should threaten the woe to such as keep the commandements of God and fayth of Iesus, which is directly contrary to the Angels speech & intendement. But it were good for you to take heed

heed lest while you shoot of such thundering peeces against others, they do indeed recoyle upon your selves.

Of M. Smyths second Reason for Anabaptisme
of elder people.

R. Clyfton.

Now let us come to the 2. Reason which is this:

2. *Because true baptisme is but one, but the Baptisme of Antichrist is not true baptisme, and so not that one baptisme of Christ. But al the members of Christ must have true baptisme.*

Answer.

1. There is but one sayth and one baptisme, Eph. 4. 4. and therefore it is sufficient to be once baptised, as it was to be once circumcised.

2. That the baptisme of Antichrist is not true baptisme, I graunt, and do also affirme that al members of Christ must have true baptisme, and what then? must it follow, that now such as are baptised, must be rebaptised, els cannot be members of a visible church? I deny it, and do further answer, 1. That the baptisme which we received in the Apostate church is no more Antichrists, then the word that we received therein: For Antichrist did never ordeyn a new kind of baptisme, but did onely pollute with his inventions that holy ordinance of Christ. And therefore if this baptisme that we have received, be called the baptisme of Antichrist, it is to affirme an untruth, seing the institution thereof was by Iesus Christ, who commanded his Apostles to baptise all nations with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Sonne, & of the H. Ghost. Mat. 28. 19. And the same baptism for substance is stil reteyned in the Apostate churches, and none other.

2. This baptisme may in some respects be called true baptisme, as before I have noted in my first reason against rebaptising: for 1. it hath Christ for the Author. 2. it hath the true matter outward signe or element, which is water. 3. the true forme of administering the same, which is, baptising into the name of the Father and of the sone, and of the holy Ghost, all which is practised in the popish Church: Neyther is any baptised into the name or sayth of Antichrist, but into the sayth or profession of Christ. And therefore our baptisme is the baptisme of Christ, and to us that repent, true baptisme, and so consequently not to be iterated.

M. Smyth.

I make Answer, that seeing Infants are baptised, which is the false matter of baptisme, and seeing in them there is not the question of a good conscience unto God. 1 Pet. 3. 21. nor the hart sprinkled from an evil conscience. Heb. 10. 22. Which is the forme. Seeing they cannot expresse, credis? credo: abrenuncias? abrenuncio: which is the forme of baptisme, even the mutual contract betwixt God and the parties baptised, expressed visible in confession: therefore the baptisme is not Christs, but antichrists.

R. Chyston.

This is the summe of your reply to my answer, that Baptisme administered in the Antichristian assemblies is of no use to the penitent, and is not baptisme at all, because both matter is false, and the forme is wanting. Of the matter (whereof you speak) which are Infants, and of the lawfulness of the baptising of Infants, I referre you for answer to the former part of this writing: Also for the matter & forme of baptisme, to that which hath been spoken thereof in this latter part. Onely thus much concerning that which you here inferre to the forme, *To be the question of a good conscience unto God, the hart sprinkled from an evil conscience, to expresse. Credis? Credo, abrenuncias? abrenuncio.* I wil answer, first, that which the Apollle speaketh to such as

were of yeares, he applyeth to infants. 2. In a good and true understanding we may and ought to think, that children have their harts sprinkled from an evil conscience, by the spirit of God, in the blood of Iesus Christ, els how could we hope they should be saved, seeing by nature they are the children of wrath. Eph. 2.3. but yet by grace the kingdome of heaven appertayns unto them. Mat. 19. 14. 3. Although a good conscience be it which ministreth assurance of comfort to the baptised, yet is not that the forme of this sacrament, as now we speak of it. First, because hypocrites in the church receive the outward signe, as S. Magus did, of who it is sayd that he was baptised: & yet neyther Simon nor any hypocrite are sprinkled from an evil conscience. 2. That which is required in the receiving of every sacrament and in al parts of the worship of God, & in the whole course of our life, cannot be the proper forme of one particular sacrament: But a * good conscience is required to be in the receivers of every sacrament, &c. 3. There is an outward baptisme, wherof "Iohn and the Ministers of the Gospel are the disposers: and "there is an inward baptisme which the Holy Ghost ministreth, which is † the sprinkling of the hart from an evil conscience, and is indeed the thing signified by the outward washing. But we must consider of Baptisme as it is external, and so to have an external forme & matter.

Lastly, for the meaning of * that place of Peter, I take to be this. That the Apostle in applying the former example, to the tymes following the coming of Christ, would teach, that the preservation of Noah in the waters was a figure of our baptisme, which is a type of our spiritual preservation from the flood of Gods wrath, saying, *that baptisme that now is saveth us also by the resurrection of Iesus Christ.* And least any might attribute overmuch to the outward Ceremonie by way of correction, he advertiseth us that salvation (to speak properly) stands in the forgiveness of our sinnes &c. by the death of Christ, and that baptisme saveth, in that it testifieth and sealeth the same unto us. And this remission of sinnes, is partly signified in putting away the filth of the soule, closely insinuated, when he sayth, *not the putting away of the filth of the flesh:* And partly in declaring the effect thereof, to wit, *the confident demanding, which a good conscience maketh to God.* For when we are washed from our sinnes we may cheerfully and with a good conscience freely call upon God.

*Dent.

16. 1 Cor.

23. 29. 3.

"Mat. 3.

Tu. 3. 3.

†Hebr. 10.

22. 23.

*1Pet. 3. 21.

Do

Now

coming

Now this being as you see the effect of remission of our finnes, & internal how shall it be the outward forme of Baptisme, which is an outward ordinance of Christ? To your credis and credo I have answered before, Neither is that which is spoken to them of yeares to be misapplied to infants, as I have shewed divers times heretofore.

Of Mr Smythes 3. Reason for Anabaptizing of Elder people.

The third Reason.

3. Because as the false Church is rejected and the true erected, the false ministerie forsaken and the true received: So false worship (and by consequent baptism) must be renounced, and the true baptism assumed.

Answer.

First, I grant that we ought to separate from all false or apostate Churches. Apoc. 18. 4. and to adioyne our selves to a true Church, reformed according to the patterne of the Apostles. 2. Also every false Ministerie is to be forsaken, Mat. 7. 15. 2 John, 10. Gal. 1. 8. and the true Ministers of God to be received. Ier. 3. 14. 15. 25. did the faithfull in Israel, that forsooke the false Preists set vp by Ieroboam and returned to the Preists of the Lord to Ierusalem, 2 Chron. 30. 11. 3. It is our dutie likewise to renounce all false worship, 2 Cor. 6. 14. 17. Efa. 30. 22. and to worship the Lord as he taught vs in his word. And thus farre do I approve of this reason, but the consequence I must deny, viz. that because false worship is to be renounced, therefore baptism also. For 1. we are to consider in that baptism

prisms received in apostate Churches two things, first that which is of God therein, secondly, that which is of man: that which is of God, is the substance of baptism, as before is observed, viz. the same matter and forme which the Lord instituted and likewise the same end, which is the profession of the faith of Christ: and this is not false worship, and so consequently not to be renounced. Againe, that which in the administration of baptism is devised by man, are those vnwarrantable ceremonies of crossing, anoynting and such like, these are to be renounced as vayne worship. *Mat. 15. 9.* *vd 10000* Now the ordinances of God are to be purged from the pollutions of men, and not with their pollutions to be renounced. For if pollution might warrant men to c away with it, that which is ordeyned of God; then might not the holy vessels polluted in Babylon, have been brought agayne to Ierusalem, nor yet the Temple it self that was so greatly prophaned, in the dayes of the idolatrous Kinges, haue been any more vled as a place of worship to the Lord.

2. I answer, that we have received as true Baptisme in the apostate Church as the people of God, did circumcision amongst the 10. Tribes: And therefore we may no more renounce it, and to assume a new, then they that returned to Ierusalem. *2 Chron. 30. 11.* might renounce their circumcision; & be recircumcised.

It is objected of some, that this comparison holdes not, for Israel was a true Church, and therefore their circumcision was true: But an apostate Church hath nothing true, neyther are the members thereof capable eyther of the covenant or seale in that standing, and: it is not true baptism to such.

*Dd2**This*

This obiection, in part I have answered before, and now answer further. 1. that the Israelites in their apostasie were not a true Church, but a false: seeing they separated from Ierusalem the true and onely Church in the world: and erected a new Church and communion amongst themselves, ioyning together in a false worship and under a false Ministerie, 1. King. 12. 30.-33. and 18. 19.-21. and so became an Harlot, Hosea 2. 2.

Secondly in the Apostate Church, there be some things true in the substance, as the word and Baptisme, though corrupted in the administration thereof by false Ministers and humane devises.

3. The members of an apostate Church are to be considered two wayes. 1. as they stand members of such a Church: 2. as they are the seed and posteritie of their forefathers, which received the covenant for themselves and their seed. And though in regard of the former estate, they have neyther right to baptisme or the covenant (for the holy thinges of God belongs not to false Churches properly) yet even to such members considered a part from such standing, and as they are the seed of their forefathers, so are they capable of the covenant and sacrament, and the same is avayleable to them upon their repentance. For in apostate Churches God hath his people which are beloved for their fathers sakes. Rom. 11. 28. & this appeareth in that he sayth, come out of her my people. Apoc. 18. 4. And to such it can not be denyed, but that to them belongs the covenant: yea whiles they are in spiritual Babylon, as it did to the Iewes that were in Babylon of Chaldea. Bondage hinders not Gods grace.

But some may reply, that they whose fathers were idolaters and unbeleevvers could have no right to the covenant to be baptised through the faith of their fathers. I answer, the right that

that children have to Gods covenant depends not onely vpon their immediate parents, but title therevnto descends vnto them from their ancestors, Exod. 20. (if we respect hercin Gods mercie,) even as mens inheritances do from their former fathers. Neyther do the members of an apostate Church, cast of all profession of faith, for they beleve the scriptures, and in Christ, &c. though withall they professe divers errors, and worship the true God in a false manner.

If question be made how it can be proved that the members of an apostate Church, had forefathers that beleaved. I answer, it can not be denyed, seing that an apostate Church ariseth not out of a company of infidels (for then could it not be called apostate, seing that to apostate, must be in regard of the truth) but is the ruines of a true Church: and therefore it must needs folow that their forefathers were beleivers and had received the covenant.

And thus haue I briefly answered these two Anabaptistical Positions with their Reasons, as the Lord hath inabled me for the present, wishing this labour might have bene taken in hand by such as could perform it better. And further intreat that the truth (which I contend for) may not, by my weak defence beare any reproch, but that which is salt worthy, let it returne vpon my head. And do also earnestly pray that he that hath thus written, and both he and they that so practise, may seriously consider of that which is done, and glorifie God by repentance.

March 14. 1608.

Rich: Clifton.

Dd 3

In the

Mr. Smyth.

In the next place you make answer to my last Argument, which may be framed into this forme: As the false Ministerie & worship are reiected, & the contrarie true Church and Ministerie assumed, so the false worship, and by consequence the false baptisme must be renounced &c. Although al that is mentioned here is taken away in the former discourse, yet it shal not be amisse to aduence something, for the further clearing of the point, 1. I deny that Popish baptisme to be true in the foure causes thereof as you affirme. 1. the Lord never instituted that infants should be baptised. 2. He never ordeyned, that Pagans should be baptised. 3. He never ordeyned that the carnall seed of the faythful should be baptised. Therefore seeing Infants that are not the seed of the faythful, but the seed of Babylonians are baptised by Antichrist,

R. Clyfton,

Answ.

Concerning the causes of baptisme, they have been formerly spoken of. To these particulars, thus I answer briefly: to the first, that the baptisme of infants is proved in the former part of this writing. To the 2. touching Pagans, that they should be baptised without confession of their sinnes & fayth, I am farre from approving. 3. Concerning the carnall seed of the faythful, (as you cal it) I have before proved, that Gods covenant is made with the faythful and their seed naturally descending from them, and have removed al your objections to the contrarie.

The matter of baptisme is false: 1. The Lord never appointed that the parties should be baptised without his own confession. &c. 1 Pet. 3. 21. Heb. 10. 22.

This is true of such as are of yeares, and now at the first to be received into the church, but not of their infants, or of the infants of the faythfull borne in the church: you alledge not one example of any borne of believing parents, whose baptisme was deferred til he was able to make confession of his owne fayth. Towching the places of 1 Pet. 3. 21. & Heb. 10. 22 I have answered unto in the former section.

Therefore the Lord doth not contract with them, for Christ wil not contract in marriage with a bride or spouse that is under age. Gal. 4. 14.

It is strange how you apply scriptures, would any that is a Scholer or made conscience of the truth, ever have applied this place of the Galathi-

ans, to prove that the Lord will not contract with the infants of the saythful: The similitude that the Apostle useth, comparing the Jewish church to an heire that is under Tutors, might teach you, that the Lord did contract with that church, how els could it ever have been his wife, and as a wife in one respect, so an heire in another, as here the Apostle calls that church. And surely she could not be called an heire, if she had not title to an inheritance, and this then must be by covenant. Besides the church of Israel was able, and did covenant with the Lord: You labour to chayne up the Lords grace, and to bynde him that he cannot promise good to the children of the saythful, or save them in Christ, except they do actually by voyce and words of their own speaking, stipulate or contract with the Lord the contrarie,† is witnessed by the holy Ghost.

† Deu. 29.
10-13.
2.39.

3. The Lord did never appoint that baptisme should seal up his new Testament to infants.

Rep.
Ans.

Of this I have spoken before throughout the first treatise. And for your selves you hold that baptisme sealeth up the covenant, n either to young nor old, and therefore you might wel have spared this particular. As for that which followes, or that infants should by his baptisme be admitted in to the body of Antichrist, &c. I grant, nor into the body of Antichrist, for Antichrist hath no right to any of the ordinances of God: but the questiō is not what he hath right unto, but whether the Lords ordinance is to be rejected together with the pollution thereof. The Lord did not appoint that Belshathers, his princes, wyves, and concubines should drink in the vessels of the Temple, or them to be caried into Babylō: but they being there prophaned, yet were caried out thence & served for the use of the Temple. And so do we hold of baptisme, & of the scriptures, rejecting the corruptions that did cleave unto them in Poperie, and applying them with their right use to our selves.

* Dan. 3.
2.3-4.
" Ear. 1.
2.3.

But the end of Christs baptisme is to manifest visibly that the partie confessing his sinne, is sealed by the spirit unto the day of redemption, that he hath visibly put on Christ, that he is mortified, crucified, risen againe &c.

Rep.

2. 12. Gal. 3. 27.

These ends of baptisme I deny not, but we must not deprive infants of this grace, neither exclude that special end of baptisme, to wit, the sealing up unto us the promise of God, which is the thing you can not away with.

Ans.

I know the true beleevers are sealed with the spirit, (a seal invisible): so were the godly under the old Test. al that are the Lords are in Christ & have his spirit dwelling in them

them, els could they not be his. And it is true also that the promise of the Spirit, hinders not the outward meanes which God hath sanctified for the begetting and increasing of our sayth, for he worketh together with them.

Seeing therefore the matter, forme and end of baptisme in the false church is from man, even from Antichrist, therefore the Lord is not the Author of this baptisme, but the baptisme is Antichrists wholly. And although he useth the words, *In nomine patris, & filij, & spiritus sancti, Amen*, as the Papists do in sprinkling holy water in baptising of their belles, & as coniuers do in their charmes, yet this can not make true baptisme &c.

How untrue that is which you speak of Baptisme in Poperie, as being from Antichrist, and not from Iesus Christ for the matter, &c. I have shewed before. The Papists when they baptise children do intend to administer baptisme, and do baptise them into the name of Christ, and not into the name of the Pope. And though they do in the use of this holy ordinance adde a number of superstitious ceremonies and observations withall, yet keep they the forme *set downe by Christ without devising a new. And therefore it is not true to say that baptisme is Antichrists wholly. The abusing of the name of God by papists or coniuers in their baptising of bells and conjurations &c. is their sinne, which we leave unto them selves: the ordinance of God we retayn, which we know their abuse cannot annihilate. And though you except these words, *In nomine patris &c.* have been prophaned by the Papists, As much may be sayd of the scriptures. And if prophanation be a cause sufficient to reject baptisme, then by lyke reason may the scriptures be cast away. And this also you are in a reasonable forwardnes, (for no translated scriptures must come in your worship) yet for some uses, you are contented to receive the scriptures, though they have been prophaned, but baptisme, for no use at all: because say you, it is essentially corrupted in matter, and forme and use, yet not another matter, forme and use: your self hath confessed, † That if Antichrist had baptised persons confessing their finnes and sayth, into the Trinitie, it should not have been repeated. So that all this storill that you make about the essential corruption in matter, forme and use, stands in this, that you hold that infants are not capable of baptisme, which is proved already against you.

Againe these corruptions in or about the matter and forme of baptisme are accidental, and not the changing of the matter, forme and end, as be-

ford

rebaptizing of elder people answered.

Love is shewed. Furthermore, whereas I sayd, that the Israelites in their apostasie were a false church, & you answer, *If so you underst and a false church, viz. meetings or companies of men assembled together in a wrong place, to a wrong worship, to a wrong Priesthood, I yield Israel to be a false church, but I deny that to be the true definition of a false church.*

By a false church I understand a church apostate, neither do I describe a false or an apostate Church, as in the first place you set downe, but such a church I hold to be in apostasie that hath fallen from the sayth and wayes of Christ * broken covenant with God, and * forsaken him, † that erects a new fellowship amongst themselves of their own insention, and worship God by the hands of false Ministers with false worship, &c. This was the state of Israel, which came to be without the "true God, &c. and therefore she was a church in apostasie, and not the true * wife of the Lord. That false is contrarie to true, I graunt, but in that sense I never intended to call Israel a false church; as having nothing that belonged to the true church in it, no more is Antichristis such a one. Yet the having of some of Gods holy things in them in a corrupt manner cannot make them true churches.

Here you endeavour to prove Israel a false church, &c. A true church is discerned in the true causes essential, and so a false church by the want of those true causes essential; the true essential causes of the church of the old Testament was the posteritie of Abraham; or profelytes circumcised; the want of those things onely made a false church.

If this be the true definition of the church under the old Testament, then what would let that the Israelites and Edomites, being circumcised, were not true churches, they were of the posteritie of Abraham, as all do know. That Israel was an Apostate church, is before proved, and by you confessed. As to your essential causes of this church, & your carnal covenant, which is the ground of your definition, you may receive answer before, pag. 12. &c. And this more, 1. That the Israelites and profelytes were a true church so long as they walked in the wayes of God, but apostating, the Lord did call them an harlot. Hof. 2, 2. 2. If these be the essential causes of that church as you have set down, then the want thereof makes them not a false church (as you say) but no Church.

Lastly, you bring us in a double respect or consideration of members of the church,

Ec

of An

Answ.

† 2 Th.

1 Tim.

* Hof.

"2 Chr.

12. 11.

† 2 Chr.

9. 1 Kin.

28. 33.

14. 9.

"2 Chr.

3.

* Hof.

2.

Repl.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

11. 20.

of Antichrist, &c. I answer, divers things. 1. I do not deny but that men may be considered two wayes, visibly as members of Antichrist body, invisibly, as pertaining to the Lords election and that is the meaning of the Apostle Rom. 11. 28. but I deny that hence it followeth that when they came from their invisible being, in Christ to a visible being in the true visible Church they shal enter in any waye but by the doore which is baptism.

First, you graunt a duple consideration may be had of members of Antichrists Church, but not altogether in the same sence as I did propound it. The members of an apostate Ch. though in respect of their outward standing they have no right to the holy things of God, yet as touching the election of God, divers of them may belong vnto him, whom he knoweth for his people, and calleth them out of Babylon, when and as it pleaseth him, even as that speech doth shew vnto vs, which sayth, *come out of her my people &c. Rev. 18. 4.* God for his promise sake made to Abraham, Isaac, and Iacob did extend his love to their seed and posteritie, to save so many of them as he had * elected: And when Israel fel into apostasie, did remember this his promise, and called thence such as he had chosen to witness his truth, and gave them to separate from their false wayes, and to returne to Ierusalem. Also the Lord having grafted the Gentiles in, and made them partakers of the roote and fatnes of the Olive tree, vouchsafeth his grace to them and their posteritie. But their apostasie, he hateth, as he did that of the Israelites. And yet notwithstanding he hath his people in Babylon, whom he calleth out to confesse his name: for the covenant is given to the beleiving Gentiles, as it was formerly to the Israelites and is no more extinguished in the apostasie of Antichrist, then in the apostasie of Israel.

And as for the meaning of Rom. 11. 28. I take to be this, that whereas question might be made of the saving of the Iewes, they being now enemies, &c. Paul granteth that they are enemies in one respect, to wit, of the Gospel, which now they received not, yet that in an other respect, they are beloved of God, to wit, for his election and promise made to the fathers, so as through the grace of his covenant, by which he had chosen that people to himself, Israel shalbe called and ingrafted agayne, and saved from their finnes, &c. But that promise was to their fathers and their seed, and this ingrafting agayne of the Iewes shalbe into that estate, from which now they

Anabaptizing of elder people, enforced.

they are fallen, and which before time their fathers were partakers of.
As concerning baptisme, I do not read that it is called the doore of the Church; the scripture hath these phrales: *Baptised into Christ*, *baptised into his death*, and such like. Notwithstanding in some sense it may be called the doore, because it sealed vnto vs Christ, who is the doore, and for that it is the first ordinance, that eyther such as came to the Church, or that are borne in the Church are made partakers of.

Whereas you intimate that a man being invisibly elect and having Title to the *promission* may thereupon, 1. visibly enter into the false Church by false baptisme, and then upon his repentance come to the true Church and enter thereinto not by baptisme, but that the doore of Antichrist shall open him the way into the Church of Christ.

I answer, 1. do not your selfe intimate thus much concerning such as being of yeares, and makes themselves profession; are baptised into Antichrist (Apostacy)? 2. My spech was of such of Gods people as are borne in Babylon, (which you selfe calles* members of a false Church) 3. Baptism that is retayned in the Apostate Church of Antichrist, is not false in that sense as you so call it, but is the ordinance of Christ there polluted, as formerly I have shewed. 4. Gods people comming out of Babylon do no more enter into the true Church without baptisme, then those his people that separated from the apostasie of Israel came to Ierusalem without circumcision, otherwise I do not intimate or speak.

Whereas I say you intimate so much, you teach contrary to Christ, who sayth we must go in by the doore, &c. and that we must first be taught and made disciples, and then be baptised, &c.

The doore is * Christ, by whome if any man enter in he shall be saved. And to be baptised first & after instructed, is not contrary to Christs commandement. The words of Christ you wrest fro the true meaning thereof to thrust infants out of the covenant and from baptisme, and so your self is guilty of teaching contrary to Christ, as formerly I have proved: and you might aswell deny Baptisme to women by that Scripture, Mat. 28. 19. as to infants: for Christ sayth, *Baptise them*, vsing the masculine gender, and not the feminine.

Ed. 2. *Secondly*

Secondly, I say that no man is under the covenant or under baptism for the parents sake and that is not the meaning of the Apostle, Rom. 11. 28. but his meaning is, that the elect of the Israelites are beloved for the promise of God made to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in respect of Christ.

This place of Rom. 11. 28. I have before expounded, pag. 218. And that any is beloved for their parents sake, (other wise then in respect of Gods free promise made vnto them and their seed, I meane not. Yet if we consider the Lords dispensation of his covenant, according to his grace of choosing a people to himself, (of which the Apostle also speaketh, Rom. 11. chap.) and how he conueigheth the same to the seed of believers, then it may be sayd, that God loveth the children for the fathers sake, with whom the Lord had made his covenant so to love them.

Not for that the children shalbe partakers of that covenant because of their parents faith, or because of Gods covenant made with their parents and their carnal issue, but because God elected them in Christ to life eternally. Secum bus actioy to gried

The children of believers are partakers of Gods covenant, because the Lord of his free gift and mercie giving it vnto their parents, includeth their seed with them, as before I have proved. And thus we are to respect the external dispensation thereof; and of this is our question, and not of the particular election, and reprobation of this or that person. For so all are not γ Israel, which are of Israel. And many to vs are visibly within the covenant, which are not elected * to salvation. Hypocrites will by lurking in a visible Church, which shall not be discerned until the last day, yet the holy things of God are administred unto them; and they of vs are to be reputed members, because visibly they appeare to vs so to be. And should we not then thus reckon of the children of the faithfull the promise being made indefinitely to "them and to their seed."

Neither is it the carnal line that is beloved of God for his mercie sake, but the spiritual line, &c.

I answer, God for his mercie sake loveth the line of the faithfull, because of his promise (as I have sayd) to chiose out therof, (ere out of their carnal line so to call it) such as he wil save by Iesus Christ: And at this line of the faithfull so long as they continue in the Church, so vs is holy & spirituall, though in Gods electio none be holy to him, but those that he hath chosen: which two things you confounding, make all this doctrine obscure unto your hearers.

Anabaptizing a father people and so forth

But what is this to prove that Antichristians are beloved and under the covenant for the carnal line descending from a believing ancestor?

I do not say that Antichristians are beloved and under the covenant unto vs. considered according to their outward standing; but this I say that in an apostate Church there be (though to us unknown until they come out thence) of Gods people that are descended of believing ancestors, and are beloved and come under the covenant because God will be found faithful in his promise, & show mercy to thousands of them that love him.

Or if it were granted, how doth it follow that the baptism visibly received in the Antichristian false Church is such baptism as bringeth us the covenant to them that the Lord hath redeemed in the false Church.

I answer, that while they remaine in that estate they can not make this comfortable use thereof unto themselves; but when such as be converted in that false Church, do separate from the same, and runne to the Lord, having sight to the covenants, they have right also to the seal, and to all the holy things of God; in that they are the people of God. And so as the word converteth, so baptism sealeth, because the efficacy thereof is of God, which can no more be hindered by the wickednes of man, then the word could be hindered from converting them that belonged to the Lord.

Lastly, whereas you fetch the Title to the covenant and in baptism for infants in the false Church, from some ancestor believing, 40. generations happy before, according to that Exod. 20. &c. I answer three things. 1. You must prove that some of our Predecessors had that actual faith and were members of true Churches, and this you must prove for every member you receive in without baptism, thereby to assure you that be had title to the covenant and baptism by his carnal line. 2. You must by the same reason receive by baptism if you can come by them, all the infants of the Thessalonians, Galatians, Colossians, Philippians and Churches of Asia that did sometimes believe. 3. I deny that you expound that place, Exod. 20. aright, for the Lord doth require that they, upon whom he sheweth mercy should fear him and keep his commandments, &c.

To the first particular, I answer, in that our Predecessors were all in apostasie: it argueth that they descended from believers. Apostasie must be from the faith once publicly defended: And where there is a public face

Ec 2

of 20

of an Apostate church, there was formerly a publike face of a church professing the truth, from which they are fallen. And even their retayning of baptisme to this day, is a confirmation thereof. Again, this is witnessed by them that came out of Babylon, that they are descended from believers, whose seed the Lord now remembereth in his mercy, to do good unto. But we are not to stand upon particulars; the general estate sheweth what was the precedent estate of Antichristians: neither are we to inquire any more into the particular condition of their Predecessors or parents, that came out of Babylon, then they of Ierusalem did inquire into the particular estates of the forefathers of those Israelites, that left the Apostate church of Ieroboam to joyne unto them. For receiuing in without baptisme you are answered before.

To your second particular I answer, that the estate of them must be considered, whether these be in Apostasie as Rome is, or be quite fallen from the faith, and be no churches at all; but as infidels that believe not in Iesus Christ and his word: if their estate were but apostasie, and that they believed the Scriptures, worshipped God and reteyned baptisme, (though all these in a corrupt manner) then should we do alike unto them, as we do to the papists. But if they were become infidels, and the candlestick removed from them, so that no steps of a church remaines amongst them, then are we to receive both parents believing, and their children, into the church by baptisme, as the Apostles in the like case did. Accordingly, for receiuing the infants of the Thessalonians &c. if we can come by them, we hold it thus, if their parents returne to the Lord and his church, or if some of the faithfull undertake their education as their own children.

In the third particular you deny, that I expound the place of Exod. 20. 6. truly. My words are set down before, pag. 213. And my meaning was this, that concerning those that are born in an apostate church, the Lord remembereth his covenant made with their forefathers that believed, & doth call of their seed, (whom it pleaseth him) to the knowledge of his truth, & faith in Christ, not regarding their immediate idolatrous and apostate parents, whose sinne can not hinder Gods promise: as the Lord did remember to shew mercy to those of Israel that left that apostate church, and returned to Ierusalem, as how he doth unto us. And this is all that I alleged this scripture for. But you in a kind of bitterness and detestation of our forefathers, do here againe utterly deny that ever they believed.

How

How religion came into our land, I have shewed before, that there have been & are beleivers in it, I make no question. And whether there have been visible churches in the Apostolical constitution, I leave to be considered by the histories forenamed, and the great persecutions they suffered for the truth of Christ. And seeing there have been so many Martirs put to death in our nation, for the witnessings of Iesus Christ & his Gospel, mynd well what wronge you do to your native countrie, in denying, that any of them did visible beleeve. And of the church of Rome, it is undeniable, that it was a true established church in the Apostles dayes.

But you wonder at mee that I should say, that seeing we are Apostates, that we had auncestors that sometime beleeved: and your reason is, *because you are departed from the scriptures, not from the faith of our Auncestors, who never a man of them beleeved in a true constituted Church.* There cannot be an Apostasie, or falling away from that we nor our fathers ever had. If we apostate from the faith of the scriptures, either we or our fathers fonce beleeved that which we are departed from, or els how is our standing apostasie?

But our fathers (say you) beleeved not in a true constituted Church. Indeed I think they did never beleeve in such an heretical Church of Anabaptists as you account a true constituted Church, that must have all the members reserved in by Anabaptisme, their children excluded: but this is certaine, that the general face of a people standing in apostasie, doth argue that there was a face of a church before professing the faith, as in the examples of Israel and the church of Rome may be seen.

This through Gods providence and blessing I am come to an happie end of answering your Writing, wherein I praise the Lord for his mercy, I have received such assurance of the truth that all the earth shal never be able to wring it out of my hart and hand. And therefore I desire you Sir, and all the leaders of the Separation to testify faithfully, even against the Lord and their owne hearts upon their beddes that which is the truth etc.

I am sorry to see how you deceive your own hart in a false persuasion to justify your errors, and most blasphemously as it were to make God a Patron thereof, by praising him for his mercy that you have received such assurance of the truth that all the earth shal not be able to wring it out of your hart.

Whereas

Mr. Sharp's third Reason, for
Whereas you are fallen from faith, separating your self from the communion of all true Churches, and become a pleader for, & a practiser of old and condemned heresies, into which you are given over of God, for your waste known to himself.

And whereas you desire me and the *Readers of the Separation* (as you call them) seriously to consider of your writings: such counsel for myne owne part, could I wish to your self, to examine your writings by the Scriptures, from the meaning whereof, you have erred pitifully; and to pray unto the Lord that this evil may be forgiven you. And to remember wel how quickly you fell into these errours, nor conferring with others or counselling with the word of God, as you should have done: but following your owne deceitful and deceiving hart, being strongly deluded by Satan, who stil doth encourage you in this new walking, that you are perswaded it is the undoubted truth that ever was revealed unto you. But know you Sir, that the works of the flesh are pleasant, whereof heresie is one. And that Satan wil strongly perswade thereto, when the Lord hath given men over to beleieve lies, that would not receive the love of the truth. And as you confesse that you may err in particulars, (as you do indeed) so think also that you may erre in your mayne points of controversie, which were unheard of in the Apostolical Churches of the first age. As you have begunne to recall your baptising of your selfe (as we heare) in some respect, vidz. in that you baptised your selfe and others without lawfull calling, &c. so proceed to renounce it altogether, with all your Anabaptistical errours. And let me say to you, in perswading you to returne unto the truth, as you say to me in moving me to error: As you love the Lord and his truth and the people that depend vpon you, embrace it, and apply not your self to shift it off: Think it a great mercy of God to offer you any meanes to see your erroneous walking. I speak unto you out of my best affection towards you, and that poor deceived company, for whose fall I have great sorrow of hart. And because you adure vs in the Lord to shew you your error, I have done for myne own part what it hath pleased God to inable me for the present, and so have others also taken paynes, if God would give you an hart to be satisfied with the truth.

On the back syde of my answer, was written thus:

If you

If you reply, shew your strength that we may make an end of these uncomfortable oppositions, &c.

Mr. Smyth.

Sir, there may be weight in my Reasons, and you happily either cannot through prejudice, or will not, through some sinister respect, see the weight of them, I pray you be not charmed by evil counsel, but either shew mee myne error, or yeeld to the truth, I would be glad to be an instrument of shewing you this truth also: at least, you by shewing us our error shall discharge a good conscience: if you do not answer among you all, I pray alone you all subtilly ligual, and lead the blinde after you into the ditch.

R. Clyfton.

Sir, what small waight is in your Reasons I have shewed in this waigh. And though you think I can not through prejudice, or will not through some sinister respect, see the waight of them, myne owne conscience doth cleere me of both these imputations. For the Lord that knoweth the secrets of the hart, is witness, that I have not of purpose to mainteyne any untruth wittingly, stopped myne eares, or shut vp mine eyes from any truth revealed vnto me, for any sinister cause or prejudice of your person: but if I did see any further truth, I would (the Lord assisting me) receive it with all thankfulness. Neyther do I hang my faith vpon the persons of men, but vpon the word of God, to be charmed by evil counsel, (evil you call that which condemneth your errors) but if by any man I receive farther instructiō or cōfirmation in the Lords truth, you ought not, nor shall not persuade me fro it, call it charming, or what you wil, I would to God we were no worse charmed by the counsel of Satan, then I am by those whom you point at, in these your speeches, I doubt not but we should then walk together comfortably in the house of God.

I have shewed you your error, as you desire. And for this truth (as you falsely call it) that you would be glad to impart onto me, I doe not herein make you glad, but wish rather that you might be sory, that wee might reioyce in your conversion.

any former truthes whereof you have bene an instrument of
sedition, which you insinuate in this word, *also*. I am thankful to God for
it. But if you remeber, that truth that you informed me of, was concerning
the trunscle of this Church wherof I stand a member, which you now hold
to be Antichristian. And therefore if I had not had better ground for my
practise, and builded my faith herein vpon the word, your revolting would
hane sent me back againe to my former estate.

For your proclayming of vs all *subtilly blind*, if we answer you not. In this
you shew stil the loftines of your spirit, as if men were bound to answer you
in every thing you write. Now you are answered both to this and to your
other heretical book of *Differences*, &c. And if you further oppose against
the truth, I trust the Lord will arme his Seruants to contend for the faith
once given to the Saints. Our cause is Gods, we feare not your forces,

Rich. Clifton.

Rich. Clifton.

Phigi. De Baptismo

FINIS.

1610

Faults escaped.

Pag. 20. line 27. the Christ, put out, the.

Pag. 21. line 3. for him, read, them.

Pag. 30. line 3. for kithin, read, within.

Pag. 130. line 18. for females, read males.

Pag. 139. line 19. read, be saved.

Pag. 173. line 14. how if, put out, how.

Pag. 149. line 4. for Rich: Clifton, read Mr Smyth.

and after line 6. read, Rich: Clifton.

Pag. 181. line 7. put out, *In Israel*.

Pag. 187. line 20. for many, read, may.

Other faults may easily be discerned.

1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525